

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*I will hear what God the Lord will speak; for He will speak peace unto His people.—Psalm 85: 8.*

O Lord, our God, we are beginning to discover that without Thee we are never at our best. It has taken some of us a long time to realize it. We have been too proud, too stubborn, too determined to have our own way. Somehow Thou hast caught up with us and we know that with Thee alone is life and love. May Thy spirit so come to life in us that we may truly live and triumphantly love.

We pray for the people of our beloved land that they, too, may grow in spirit and by Thy grace be made more than a match for the mood of this day.

Help us to work together for peace in our world, for justice among our citizens, and for good will in the hearts of all.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1963. An act for the relief of employees of General Services Administration;

H.R. 2517. An act to amend sections 64a, 238, 378, and 483 of the Bankruptcy Act and to repeal sections 354 and 459 of the act;

H.R. 2518. An act to amend sections 337 and 338 of the Bankruptcy Act and to add new section 339;

H.R. 2519. An act to amend sections 334, 355, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act;

H.R. 2834. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to the participation of the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization;

H.R. 3403. An act for the relief of Harry LeRoy Jones;

H.R. 3727. An act for the relief of Elpidio Dimacali Damazo and Natividad Simsuangco Damazo;

H.R. 3799. An act for the relief of the city of Pawtucket, R.I.;

H.R. 6324. An act for the relief of John A. Danisch;

H.R. 7599. An act for the relief of Dr. Emanuel Marcus;

H.R. 7811. An act for the relief of Richard Alan White; and

H.R. 8632. An act to amend sections 40c(1) and 52a of the Bankruptcy Act so as to reallocate part of the filing fee from the clerk's earnings to the referees' salary and expense fund.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7427. An act for the relief of Maria Kolometrousis; and

H.R. 12910. An act to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2) entitled "An act to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 687. An act for the relief of Tim Shik Chin;

S. 964. An act for the relief of Roberto Perdomo;

S. 1040. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy;

S. 1470. An act for the relief of the Ida group of mining claims in Josephine County, Oreg.;

S. 1652. An act for the relief of Anastasia D. Mpatziani;

S. 1664. An act for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans.;

S. 1918. An act for the relief of Dr. Gabriel Gomez del Rio;

S. 1925. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Martinez Serrera;

S. 2031. An act for the relief of certain employees at the Naval Air Test Center, U.S. Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md.;

S. 2153. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Rafael Montalvo y Urrutibeascoa;

S. 2199. An act for the relief of Oscar Juan Enriquez-Santos;

S. 2206. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Rolando Guerra-Reyes;

S. 2264. An act for the relief of Chi Jen Feng;

S. 2265. An act for the relief of Christopher Nicholas Rushton;

S. 2301. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco Guillermo Gomez-Inguanzo;

S. 2381. An act for the relief of Dr. Jesus Adalberto Quevedo-Avila;

S. 2382. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose R. Sanchez;

S. 2384. An act for the relief of Jorge A. Marrero;

S. 2386. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis F. Rodriguez Iznaga; and

S. 2468. An act for the relief of Dr. George S. Ioannides.

## WORK PLANS UNDER SECTION 2 OF WATERSHED AND PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D.C., November 16, 1967.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
The Speaker,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture today considered and unanimously approved the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication No. 1178, 90th Congress. The work plans involved are: Rancho Viejo, Tex.; Spring-Bull, S. Dak.; Main Street Canyon, Calif.; Big Running Water Ditch, Ark.

Sincerely yours,

W. R. POAGE,  
Chairman.

## THE PRESIDENT'S PRESS CONFERENCE

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened to that portion of President Johnson's news conference where he was asked about his bill for a tax increase which is now stalled in the House Ways and Means Committee. In the most pious and sorrowful tones the President lamented that he was having a very difficult time to get this Congress to "act with fiscal responsibility."

What sheer hypocrisy. This is the same President who not long ago was boasting that in the short time he had been President he had tripled expenditures in several different areas of the Government. This is the same President who this year submitted a budget so loose and irresponsible that when we complete action on the various appropriation bills, we will have reduced it by around \$6 billion.

No, Mr. President, any sermons delivered by you to Congress on the subject of fiscal responsibility are about as consistent with your past actions as it would be for the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] to get up here and tell us that he has consistently fought for bigger and expanded foreign aid programs.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 393]

Abbott	Farbstein	Mathias, Md.
Adams	Findley	Meeds
Andrews, Ala.	Fino	Morgan
Annunzio	Ford	Pike
Arends	William D.	Pucinski
Ashley	Fountain	Purcell
Aspinall	Fulton, Tenn.	Reld, Ill.
Bates	Fuqua	Resnick
Belcher	Gialmo	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bell	Gilbert	Rivers
Berry	Green, Oreg.	Robison
Bevill	Gurney	Rodino
Broomfield	Hagan	Rogers, Fla.
Brown, Ohio	Halleck	Rostenkowski
Burke, Fla.	Hanna	St. Onge
Carey	Hansen, Idaho	Schadeberg
Celler	Hansen, Wash.	Schwengel
Clancy	Harrison	Scott
Clark	Hawkins	Shipley
Clawson, Del.	Hays	Springer
Cowger	Heckler, Mass.	Stephens
Davis, Wis.	Herlong	Stuckey
Dawson	Hicks	Thomson, Wis.
Denney	Howard	Utt
Derwinski	Hull	Walker
Devine	Johnson, Pa.	Watkins
Diggs	Jones, N.C.	Whitener
Dingell	Kee	Williams, Miss.
Edmondson	Kluczynski	Willis
Edwards, Ala.	Laird	Wilson, Bob
Ellberg	Landrum	Wright
Eshleman	McClary	Wyder
Everett	MacGregor	Zion
Evins, Tenn.	Martin	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 332 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE ON S. 2388, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may be excused as a conferee on the bill S. 2388, and that the Speaker be authorized to appoint a Member to fill the vacancy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] to fill the vacancy.

#### FIVE FACTS STAND IN THE WAY OF A REPUBLICAN VICTORY IN 1968

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are trying desperately to claim victory in 1968. They are encouraging news stories that they have their best chance in years to capture the White House.

I hate to dash their hopes or shatter their morale, but there are a few facts worth considering before the victory celebrations begin.

Fact No. 1: 42 percent of the American electorate are Democrats, and 31 percent independents.

Fact No. 2: Only 27 percent are Republicans.

Fact No. 3: If every Republican voted for their candidate but he failed to win the votes of substantial numbers of Democrats and independents, the Republicans would lose.

Fact No. 4: The Republicans have yet to unearth a presidential candidate who can inspire confidence and trust among the American people.

Fact No. 5: The President will go to the American people in 1968 with more than 90 percent of his 1964 campaign pledges fulfilled—an unprecedented achievement.

In short, we Democrats will allow the Republicans to hold their victory celebrations this November; we will hold ours next November.

#### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 13893) making appropriations for foreign assist-

ance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 13893, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, it had agreed to an amendment striking section 106, ending on page 8, line 11, from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 107. (a) No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, in addition to those items contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any other articles, materials, or supplies of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war or of strategic significance to the conduct of war, including petroleum products.

(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, or to North Vietnam.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: On page 8, line 12, strike out lines 12 through 25, inclusive, and strike out on page 9, lines 1 through 5, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the close of the debate yesterday I indicated that I had a total of eight amendments to offer. This amendment is the third of the eight. I would like to ask unanimous consent to offer for simultaneous consideration four other amendments which are also at the Clerk's desk.

Let me say, in consideration of whether the unanimous consent should be granted, that in every case my motivation is based on the fact that there already is legislation on the subject covered by the sections which I propose to delete. In my opinion the identical language already is on the books, or similar language, or stronger language. This fact more than justifies the deletion of legislation of this kind from an appropriation act.

I am contemplating one more amendment, I might say, which would propose the deletion of section 119.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, is a unanimous-consent request pending?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at this moment. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I intended to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GROSS. I think we ought to know what sections of this bill would be affected. The bill not having been read, we ought to know to what sections of the bill the gentleman proposes to offer amendments. I have an amendment I wish to offer to the bill, and I do not want to be ruled out.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from New Jersey made his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make such a request. Before I do so, perhaps I should indicate what my amendments would propose to delete from the bill.

The pending amendment which I have just offered proposes the deletion of section 107.

The second amendment that I would offer would propose deletion of section 109. The third amendment would propose the deletion of section 114. The fourth amendment would propose the deletion of section 116. The fifth amendment would delete section 117.

Now, I should like to renew my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, getting to the subject of the deletion of section 107, I should like to point out that section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act already has similar language. The language to which I refer, which has been on the books, for some time—I hesitate to read it, because it takes so long—is far more inclusive, I might say, than the language proposed by section 107. Let me begin with section 620(a):

SEC. 620. PROHIBITIONS AGAINST FURNISHING ASSISTANCE.—(a) (1) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to the present government of Cuba; nor shall any such assistance be furnished to any country which furnishes assistance to the present government of Cuba unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States. As an additional means of implementing and carrying into effect the policy of the preceding sentence, the President is authorized to establish and maintain a total embargo upon all trade between the United States and Cuba.

(2) Except as may be deemed necessary by the President in the interest of the United States, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any government of Cuba, nor shall Cuba be entitled to receive any quota authorizing the importation of Cuban sugar into the United States or to receive any other benefit under any law of the United States, until the President determines that such government has taken appropriate steps according to international law standards to return to United States citizens, and to entities not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or to provide equitable compensation to such citizens and entities for property taken from such citizens and entities on or after January 1, 1959, by the Government of Cuba.

(3) No funds authorized to be made available under this Act (except under section 214) shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which has failed to take appro-



prate steps, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963—

(A) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to Cuba (other than to United States installations in Cuba)—

(i) any items of economic assistance.

(ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or

(iii) any other equipment, materials, or commodities, so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime; and

(B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from Cuba (other than from United States installations in Cuba) so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, is the difference between the section of law from which the gentleman is now reading and the amendment in the bill the provision which gives the President "authority to do otherwise" if he deems it in the national interest? Is that a difference?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As I just said, there is a provision which allows the President to determine in such cases where it is in the national interest that aid can be given.

Mr. KYL. If the gentleman will yield further, there is no such language I can find in the amendment offered by the committee at this time. Is that correct?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman is correct. The full text of section 107 of the bill reads as follows:

Sec. 107. (a) No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, in addition to those items contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any other articles, materials, or supplies of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war or of strategic significance to the conduct of war, including petroleum products.

(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, or to North Vietnam.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, under the language just referred to by the gentleman, section 107(a), does it contain a Presidential determination?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I just answered the gentleman that I see no such language, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Does the language of

the authorization bill contain a Presidential determination?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I just answered that question, I think, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am sorry. I did not hear the gentleman's answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

(On request of Mr. KYL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I would like to add that this discussion does show the difficulty of legislating on the floor and comparing fairly complicated and extensive language differences between legislative proposals and legislation on the books.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I believe I understand what the gentleman is trying to do, which is to strike language from the legislation we are now considering and prove that similar language is already in the Foreign Assistance Authorization Act. But we are working now at a time when we are not sure. The gentleman states that the language in the present bill before us is duplication. We have no assurance whatsoever that what the gentleman is doing will not reduce the effectiveness of both the language in the Foreign Assistance Act and the language contained in this bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say to the gentleman, if the Appropriations Committee had done its homework and had compared the language already on the books with respect to foreign assistance with the language in its own bill, the Members would be able to see that the language already on the books is far more comprehensive than the proposed language.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. If the gentleman will yield further? The language the gentleman now seeks to delete from the appropriation bill is not new language this year. It has been in the bill for some time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have not contended that it is new language. The fact that it is old language makes it no less subject to criticism and analysis and discussion. Quite obviously, the rule does allow us at least to look at the language, even though it may have been incorporated in previous appropriation bills.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Am I wrong in my view that by having it in both bills we are doubly sure?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not believe, I might say to the gentleman, that this gives one iota of assurance. I believe all it does is befog and confuse the issue, because in some respects this language does differ. If we want a policy position with respect to Cuba and North Vietnam or trade with Communist countries, it seems to me we speak with more assurance speaking with one voice instead of two. For that reason, the placing of policy statements and restrictions of

this kind should be in authorization bills only. If we need improvements from time to time, we should improve those acts. We should not involve ourselves now in policy determinations attempting to compare the value of additional language which may conflict to some extent on a particular subject.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. If the gentleman will yield further, in the law which the gentleman has before him, the Foreign Assistance Act, where does it cover the following language:

To any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry, to carry to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say to the gentleman, if he will read the language of the law the answer will be obvious.

Section 620(a)(3), subsection (B):

No funds authorized to be made available under this Act (except under section 214) shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps.

(B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from the transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from Cuba (other than from United States installations in Cuba) so long as Cuba is governed by the Castro regime.

The gentleman is demonstrating, without any question, my point that this situation is already covered in the law more explicitly than it would be by this attempt in an appropriation bill.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. As I said earlier, I understand what the gentleman is attempting to do, but I am concerned because we are doing this in a rush on the floor. I do not want in any way to weaken the administration of either the Foreign Assistance Authorization Act or the foreign assistance appropriation bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say my intent is not to weaken the administration of the Foreign Assistance Act. My purpose is to let there be but one clear voice of Congress, already expressed. Congress should not speak with confusion. There are different provisions on basic problems. This may result in conflict and a lack of ability to move at a time when we need to move.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The matter of Presidential discretion is apparently the item which bothers a number of Members at this point. If the language presently in the bill remains in the bill there is a technical question. Would it repeal the Presidential discretion which is already in the law? This is not an amendment of the section, actually.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman makes a good point. To what extent would this apparently flat prohibition prevent the use of the discretionary power of the President?

Mr. KYL. Which exists.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would think this would be a clear reason to avoid a possible conflict between two different laws. Why not leave the Presidential de-

termination language already in the act, and which we certainly are not attempting to repeal here, and not confuse the issue by having a flat prohibition?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if you recall, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. MORGAN], voted for the rule to bring out the bill that is presently under consideration. Many Members have strong feelings about the legislation in this bill. If we attempt to water this bill down and take out the sections that we thought would give the Congress and the country protection, then I am of the opinion that you are going to wind up without any bill whatsoever. Mr. MORGAN, the great chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is absent today. He expressed no objection to this language at the time we were considering it in general debate yesterday. I have not had an opportunity to ascertain as to whether or not all of this legislation is carried line by line verbatim in the Committee on Foreign Affairs' authorization bill. We did not think so at the time we put the language in our bill. I certainly hope the members of the Committee will vote this amendment down. We are not going to be able to rewrite this bill to satisfy the wishes of a few of my friends who are assigned to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I certainly hope it will be voted down. If it is an exact duplication word by word, then, of course, adjustments can be made when the bill goes to conference. I hope the Committee will vote down this amendment and let us get on with consideration of the bill.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I also urge the Committee to vote this amendment down.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the great chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is absent today and cannot therefore take part in this debate. On my part, I have rarely if ever tried to speak for anyone else. I cannot speak for the chairman but I think the record should be made clear. I understand that he voted for the rule. I understand why he voted for the rule. It is my understanding that he gave a commitment to those who wanted to have this bill brought to the floor without delay. But I also understand that he did not do it with any particular desire to have a rule which would waive points of order against legislation in this appropriation bill. That is what I am told and that is what the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and those of us who are endeavoring to straighten out the confusion this committee is in today believe. We are endeavoring to eliminate the confusion by striking out the duplication which this bill would create. I am completely in

favor of the amendment suggested by my colleague [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] and I hope his amendment prevails.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee will vote down this amendment. We believe we have a good bill. There are good and sufficient reasons why we have this language in the bill. I think it would be a mistake to weaken the language in the bill. I trust the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have been up this hill and down this hill before. This is the same issue, as I see it, that has been before this House time and time again. The amendment contained in the bill before us which the gentleman's amendment would strike—and I oppose the striking amendment—reinstates language which I offered on the floor of this House a number of years ago that makes it mandatory—and that is the issue—makes it mandatory and not discretionary with the President to provide no aid to Cuba.

I know how he has exercised that discretion in the past. He has exercised the discretion, so far as I am concerned, coming from a district and a State 90 miles from Cuba, a Communist-dominated nation in the solar plexus of the Western Hemisphere—he has exercised it to the point where if something is not done, the Communist control of Cuba will be there ad infinitum. If something is not done by the President and by the State Department and by this Congress mandating the executive branch of the Government no longer to give aid to countries trading with Cuba, this country itself will not be doing all in its power to deal with Cuban communism.

Mr. Chairman, this problem is going to be here unless we act with firmness. This Communist-dominated nation is going to remain and the threat of a foreign ideology exists through the operations of the Communists 90 miles from our shores if they are allowed to continue to be there and yes, even, the missiles that were there and were maintained are to some extent there now or if not, can be reinstated and thus, it poses a constant threat to our freedoms.

Mr. Chairman, the threat in the future is to the same extent as it existed in the past. As Castro arms, trains guerrillas and gets economically more entrenched, the threat becomes entrenched.

Mr. Chairman, we have to make up our minds as to whether we are going to mandate the executive branch of the Government to do something about this situation, or whether we are going to give to the President the discretion to make the determination that weakens our resolve. That is the difference.

Mr. Chairman, the wording is very clear. The present law says that—

No assistance shall be furnished under the Act unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, how did that "unless" get in there? It got in there as a substitute to my amendment without such discretion that I offered to the Foreign Assistance Act which contained the re-

strictions which in my opinion I felt were necessary. The gentleman would strike the language in this bill similar to my previous amendment. I say this, Mr. Chairman, because the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] offered the substitute that gave the President such discretion and thus defeated my amendment providing for no aid to Cuba. I opposed the weakening Presidential discretion in consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 and I oppose it now.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the bill, as it came from the committee will be enacted. It is consistent with my amendment in 1963. Otherwise, we are going to get nothing done and the threat is going to still remain there. As it is under the FASCELL language of section 600(1) that was substituted for my nondiscretion, absolute prohibition amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we spend billions of dollars to fight communism 6,000 miles away, but yet we do little that is effective about fighting communism when we have it at our own back door. In other words, we are not willing to stand up and make sure the money of the taxpayers is not used for Cuba, directly or indirectly in this effort, while we spend billions other places far away to fight distant communism.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] for answering very quickly, understandably, and with clarity the question to my question even prior to my asking it.

Mr. CRAMER. And, Mr. Chairman, there is a further exception which this proposes to do something about, and that is section 692 which reads:

Except as deemed necessary by the President in the interest of the United States, no assistance shall be furnished to the government while Cuba is under the present government.

So, Mr. Chairman, there are two exceptions that this action, in the bill before us if approved, would repeal. I want those discretionary exceptions eliminated and the FRELINGHUYSEN amendment would reinstate them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Florida that I feel the gentleman raises a very interesting question.

At the outset I would like to say that I agree with the gentleman that a mandatory provision against and to Cuba is needed. I have long supported such a proposal. I supported it when the gentleman from Florida offered it in a prior Congress.

However, it is my opinion that the gentleman is incorrect in his position that the passage of this legislation now pending before the House, without the amendment striking it, would have the effect of removing the prior discretion of



the President. This is not correct. We have had a second and specific statement to the effect that the legislation is not being repealed in this legislation. It is important that our position be clear and unequivocal. Passing this language will confuse it. The amendment should be adopted.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that insofar as the spending of any money under this authorization is concerned, in my opinion it clearly represents a further restriction, beyond basic law, that the Congress clearly intend to do and that is that we should not extend this type of aid to countries which trade with Cuba, and that is what we have got to do. I agree, however, we cannot avoid the effect less restrictively in an appropriation bill than contained in the basic act but a restriction on spending having the effect of limiting spending is proper and is accomplished, and should be.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. This entire matter of Presidential determination I feel should be looked at rather carefully, because the legislation to which it applies here and elsewhere, differs widely. For example, the Banking and Currency Committee with reference to the Export-Import Bank bill said in the matter of Presidential determination that the President must notify both the House and the Senate 30 days before such determination is made, and it has got to be approved by the appropriate committees of the Congress. In this Foreign Assistance Act the wording is entirely different. The Banking and Currency Committee strengthened that language considerably. I feel that this entire matter of Presidential determination should be standardized.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, and the President does not have to consult Congress under the amendment which is offered which has the effect of reinstating the less restrictive basic act. The gentleman indicates another example of the congressional efforts to limit Presidential discretion.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, were it not for the fact a point of order would be made against it, I would introduce an amendment to H.R. 13893, the foreign aid appropriation bill, to provide that no funds could go to any country whose vessels harass or seize American fishing vessels on the high seas outside the 12-mile limit. I recognize that such an amendment should have been offered during debate on the foreign aid authorization bill last August, however, Mr. Chairman, at that time I was being assured by the Department of State that conditions were looking good for negotiations to resolve the problems which have arisen by Ecuador's and some other Latin American nations' claim of 200 miles jurisdiction off their coast.

But, since then, Ecuador has militantly harassed, machine-gunned, and forced into port, another American fishing vessel, the *Puritan*, dispelling in my mind,

any desire on their part to negotiate. Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, the owner of the *Puritan* was compelled to purchase a license to fish at a price of over \$16,000, even though she was sitting dead in the water, 70 miles off the Ecuadorian coast.

In the past few years American fishermen have had to risk their lives unnecessarily off Latin America in the pursuit of their vocation. They have been seized, chased, harassed, tied up in port for long periods of time and some men have even been shot. Fortunately, there have been no fatal incidents, but I do not understand why it should be necessary for American citizens to have to risk these physical dangers while working in a vital industry on the high seas.

Mr. Chairman, I have requested, and even introduced legislation to provide Coast Guard protection for these American citizens, but all I received in response was a State Department letter that they did not want to "meet force with force."

Well, Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that force of some kind is necessary, be it force of argument, or force of withholding funds such as this foreign aid appropriation provides.

I am determined that as long as I am in this Congress, I will do my utmost to help American fishermen, and all other American citizens, from this type of thievery, both at home and abroad.

Again, I regret I cannot amend this bill so as to stop all aid to any nation illegally seizing our fish boats.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in this, as in many others, I believe the membership realizes that there is no continuing resolution, there is no authority from this point on to make payments. The continuing resolution is resting with the conferees.

I should like to report to my colleagues what has been going on so that when we reach a crisis here in a few days they will understand that there have been no conferences since a week ago Wednesday to try to solve this very important question. And I would hope that the conferees of the House and of the Senate meet every day until this matter of a continuing resolution is resolved, because we are going to be in a real crisis here some day when the people are not going to be paid.

I agreed to the one bringing it up to November 9 in order that they could be paid through this payday, and this is probably one of the last paydays, and we are going to be facing a real problem.

But this House has voted on three occasions for a spending limitation. It seems to me we ought to be in conference working the will of this House, and not waiting until we are faced with a crisis of a number of people not being paid, and obligations of the Government not being taken care of.

I just want to point out one thing to the Members, and that is that limitation was \$131.5 billion that this House approved. The President in his press conference today rather chided the Congress

and said that it now appears that Congress will only cut about \$1 billion out of the \$145 billion in expenditures contained in his budget for fiscal 1968.

The President said we were only going to cut \$1 billion. My distinguished chairman the other day said that we were going to cut \$2.6 billion. But if we put a spending limitation on expenditures we will make some real savings for the American people.

So I would hope that the conferees will be back in session, and begin to discuss this matter and try to reach some solution.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for being kind enough to yield.

From the districts of my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and myself, we have been advised because of a misunderstanding apparently of the executive branch of the Government about the meaning of the continuing resolution, which was put through, that 700 people under the poverty program in Dade County in Mr. FASCELL's district and in my district are not going to be paid today.

Some of those people work in the day care centers, and some of them work in the neighborhood centers, some in other activities. They work under what we call the Economic Opportunity Program, Inc., which is the community action program, the approved economic opportunity program, and they get their money from grants so they were not literally on the Federal payroll. But they are, of course, a part of the program.

Mr. Chairman, they are very much concerned about this matter.

I spoke to the able Senator from my State, Senator HOLLAND, this morning. He said that it was the intention of the Senate conferees in the conference that the effect of this continuing resolution that all people who were working under the program up to November 9 shall be paid for that work at the next payday, and that he would be willing to make such a statement on the floor of the Senate, and invited me to inquire as to this of our distinguished colleagues in this body.

Mr. BOW. In reply to the gentleman from Florida, may I say that when the House agreed to the continuing resolution, through November 9, it was my impression and my intention that these people who were working would be paid through this payday. I would not want to penalize the people who are working because of an impasse here. And that is the reason I agreed to it.

I will not agree to any more, because we ought to settle this matter of the continuing resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. It was the intention, then, of the conferees on the part of the House, as I understood the able gentleman from Ohio, who was just speaking, that this would include a payday for these people who worked under this contract program up to November 9?

Mr. BOW. Yes; because that would be

the pay for that time that they worked. Does my distinguished chairman agree with me—I mean on the question of whether these people should be paid?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I am not sure what the facts and circumstances are in the case presented. It depends upon whether or not payment can be made in accordance with law.

There are certain programs that have gotten into difficulty. Wherever money is due it should be paid. But we cannot encourage a disregard of the law. I believe the case must rest on the facts. The continuing resolution expired on November 9. The previous resolution expired on October 23.

Mr. BOW. I will say to my distinguished chairman, this is not an attempt on my part to disregard the law.

It seems to me when we passed this resolution, it was for the purpose of taking care of the obligations up to this point. This is my feeling on it. But as of this point on, there is no opportunity to pay.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the able chairman allow me to say that I have consulted with the Economic Opportunity authorities and they have told me that there are 40 communities in the United States similarly situated to Mr. FASCELL's and mine where the people will not be paid unless we can have an understanding that those people who were paid on the last payday will get one more payday—and not beyond that—whether they were under a grant program dealing with or working for a contract agency—or literally getting their check directly from the Federal Government.

Of course, this means a great deal to many people in many communities throughout the country.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the officials in the Office of Economic Opportunity, who are in charge of day-to-day administration, do not think they have the legal right to pay, I, of course, could not say that they should violate the law.

We have gotten into this predicament to a very considerable extent as the result of the long delay in getting the authorization bill for the Office of Economic Opportunity enacted.

Mr. BOW. May I just ask my distinguished chairman why we have not met in conference since a week ago last Wednesday to try to correct this situation?

Mr. MAHON. I think I would not have time to explain that since the gentleman's time is about to expire, but I will move to strike out the last word in a moment and comment on that if I may.

Mr. PEPPER. The able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has been the leader in the effort to reduce expenditures and he is now making it clear that up until—and through this payday for work performed up to November 9—he does not intend anybody to be taken off the payroll or not to be paid for the services that they have rendered up until November 9. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio did not mean that those people who have been working to November 9 will not be paid.

Mr. BOW. That is paid up until this time.

Mr. PEPPER. It looks like we could collaborate on this matter and just recognize that anybody who has worked under this program should be paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Several of our departments and agencies have found that they had no authority to operate beginning July 1 because there was no authorizing legislation, and hence no appropriation.

So we in Congress passed continuing resolutions on several different occasions, and still the authorization bills were not enacted in all cases.

We find ourselves in some difficulty as a result of delays in authorization bills.

With respect to the continuing resolution which passed the House sometime ago, the last one, except for the one attached to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, we had a conference meeting with the other body on October 26.

We had another meeting on October 27.

The other body was adamant in its position against the so-called Whitten-Bow amendments and would not agree to the position taken by the House. We would not recede from our position and there was a deadlock.

We met again on October 31 and then we met again on November 3.

Then we met again on November 8, a week ago Wednesday, and we seemed to make some progress at that meeting. I am hopeful that some sort of settlement of this resolution can be achieved. It is not clear that it can. We plan to meet again next week.

But the House has not been willing to capitulate to the other body, and therefore we have not agreed. If we had gone over to the other body and agreed with the conferees of that body, and if we had brought back a simple continuing resolution, the matter could have been voted on again but we felt the House would not agree to a simple resolution. We are seeking to work out a compromise. The Senate conferees would not accept the House position. That is where we find ourselves at this time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I think we should point out at this time the unwritten rule that is in the rule book which states that when one body passes a bill and another body amends that bill, they must recede. In case of failure of the bill, the body that amended the bill or the joint resolution takes the responsibility for failure of the bill or joint resolution. Therefore, the Senate having amended our bill, if there is a bill, should this crisis come, they must accept the responsibility. That is the rule of the conference.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has made an interesting comment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, what we are seeking to do now is to get an agreement as to what the intention of the continuing resolution was. If I am not being presumptuous, I see on the floor today the able gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]. I spoke to him yesterday first after the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and I heard from our people that 700 people would not be paid today, to determine whether or not it was the contemplation of that resolution, as he understood it, to include these people that I am talking about. He said, "Yes."

Then we went to see the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], and he said, "Yes."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who apparently was one of the senior representatives of the other body, said that that was his understanding, and he would so state on the floor of the other body. If we could get unanimity that that is what was intended, it seems to me the executive agency, for this one payday alone, would recognize the intention of the conferees who have reported out this resolution.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the agencies are pretty liberal in interpreting the law in their favor, and if the lawyers in the Office of Economic Opportunity do not believe that they can legally pay these people, I would be inclined to accept their view rather than my own off-the-cuff view with respect to the specific problem that may be confronting the agency.

I would be glad to look further into this question and do what I can as a member of the House Appropriations Committee to be helpful. But I am not willing to put a construction on the question which the people who have much to gain by this construction are unwilling to place upon the matter themselves.

Mr. Chairman, under leave granted, may I add that the last extension of the continuing resolution was included in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1968. This extension was from October 23 to November 9.

It seems to me to be quite clear that since November 9 there has been no authority for the agencies that do not have their regular appropriations for fiscal year 1968 to incur new obligations. I do not see how any discussion in the House and/or the Senate can change the fact that the authority contained in the continuing resolution is not now effective and has not been since November 9.

I asked our staff to make a quick check



this afternoon, and as I understand the situation with regard to the Office of Economic Opportunity, there are certain grant programs under the community action program that have expired since November 9 that probably would have been extended if the authority existed to make the additional grants. Frankly, I know of no authority they have to make such additional grants and I am informally advised that their lawyers know of no such authority.

I regret that this situation may result in the disruption of programs and perhaps also in personal hardship in some instances. However, as I explained, we have tried several times to resolve the differences between the House and the Senate on the extension of the continuing resolution that is now in conference, and have been unable to do so. We are seeking to resolve the matter.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able gentleman. Would the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee be good enough to have his technical people look into this matter to see if possibly before the end of the day appropriate statements might be made in the two bodies that might resolve this dilemma?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would certainly be glad to cooperate in every possible way. I hope a way can be found to pay people who have been working. I am in favor of doing everything we can legally do to alleviate this hardship. I want to cooperate with the gentleman. I commend him for undertaking to be helpful to people who are involved in this situation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, one of the arguments advanced by those who supported the writing of legislation in this appropriation bill, contrary to the usual rules of the House, was the fact that the Foreign Affairs Committee, and perhaps especially the conferees on that bill, took so much time in conference. It was, however, pointed out that the time we took in conference was to a considerable degree the fault of Members of the other body who were absent and thus made the holding of conferences impossible. It is interesting today, Mr. Chairman, to observe now that members of the Appropriations Committee are here complaining that they, in turn, are having difficulties getting to an agreement with conferees of the other body.

Now, Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances, I think it only fair that members of the Foreign Affairs Committee offer to assist the members of the Appropriations Committee in their efforts to get to an agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 108. Any expenditure made from funds provided in this title for procurement out-

side the United States of any commodity in bulk and in excess of \$100,000 shall be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at least twice annually: *Provided*, That each such report shall state the reasons for which the President determined, pursuant to criteria set forth in section 604(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, that foreign procurement will not result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States or the industrial mobilization base which outweigh the economic or other advantages to the United States of less costly procurement outside the United States.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I have a pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in section 108, we find the language which says the President must make a determination that foreign procurement shall not result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States. In the interest of time, I refer Members to the sections on page 17 and 18, for the Inter-American Development Bank, which includes \$300 million for payment of the third installment of supplementary contributions of the United States for the International Development Association, \$104 million, in the next section, for the Export-Import Bank, and \$2,550,000. All of these things together become very important in our consideration of this legislation when we read the news of the day.

According to an authoritative financial paper, the Wall Street Journal, the U.S. deficit in international transactions deepened in the third quarter, indicating the 1967 dollar outflow will be the largest in 3 years. The overall deficit was a seasonally adjusted \$670 million. The Commerce Department reported the most adverse showing since early 1965. The surplus of merchandise trade slipped only slightly from the second quarter, but bank lending overseas spurred. Foreign investments by banks, and business firms according to the Journal, were subjected by the Treasury today to tighter but still voluntary curbs for 1968 in view of this outflow.

Secretary Fowler in commenting said that the curbs have been "extended more often than we would like" but explained that:

This is a consequence of a large foreign exchange cost in connection with Vietnam.

This is a significant statement from the Secretary.

We must not—

He said—

in any way slacken our efforts to reduce the payments deficit.

He pointed out there will be more stress next year on getting companies to borrow abroad.

Here, Mr. Chairman, we have the Treasury Department of the United States urging American business on the one hand to reduce investments abroad, to borrow funds abroad. Then at the same time, in legislation which we consider today, we are trying to do just the opposite thing, plus having the Federal Government itself engage in the distribution of American dollars abroad.

I believe it is significant, when we consider this legislation for foreign aid today, to think a bit about the serious balance-of-payments problem and the in-

consistent effort that we demonstrate downtown and here on this day.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 109 (a) No assistance shall be furnished to any nation, whose government is based upon that theory of government known as communism under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, for any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials, or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished to any nation whose government is based upon that theory of government known as communism under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (except section 214(b)), unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: On page 9, line 19, strike out lines 19 through 24 inclusive and on page 10, lines 1 through 18 inclusive.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I realize the difficulty of one individual arguing with the distinguished Committee on Appropriations. I want to assure them, as well as all other members of this Committee, that I am seeking no argument. I hope on this amendment we can reach agreement.

My proposal is, quite simply, to strike section 109, which refers to limitations and restrictions on giving any aid or assistance to countries governed by Communists.

I do so not in any way to weaken the bill, or modify our attitude toward those countries. Intimation was made when I offered my last amendment that if it were accepted, and if certain language were deleted, that our attitude might in some way be weakened.

I do this primarily to avoid the inevitable confusion between conflicting but very similar policy statements—those made in an appropriation bill, which I consider inappropriate, and those already enacted into law.

I wish time would permit an adequate discussion of the differences in the language.

I refer specifically to section 620(b) and 620(f) of the basic Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

Section 620(b) is a one-sentence section:

No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to the government of any country unless the President determines that such country is not dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement.

Section 620(f) reads as follows:

(f) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act, as amended (except section 214(b)), to any Communist country. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act unless the President finds and promptly reports to Congress that: (1) such assistance is vital to the security of the United States; (2) the recipient country is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy; and (3) such assistance will further promote the independence of the recipient country from international communism. For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase "Communist country" shall include specifically, but not be limited to, the following countries:

Peoples Republic of Albania,  
Peoples Republic of Bulgaria,  
Peoples Republic of China,  
Czechoslovak Socialist Republic,  
German Democratic Republic (East Germany),  
Estonia,  
Hungarian Peoples Republic,  
Latvia,  
Lithuania,  
North Korean Peoples Republic,  
North Vietnam,  
Outer Mongolia-Mongolian Peoples Republic,  
Polish Peoples Republic,  
Rumanian Peoples Republic,  
Tibet,  
Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia,  
Cuba, and  
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (including its captive constituent republics).

In contrast, the text of the language contained in section 109 of the bill before us reads as follows:

SEC. 109. (a) No assistance shall be furnished to any nation, whose government is based upon that theory of government known as communism under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, for any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished to any nation whose government is based upon that theory of government known as communism under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (except section 214(b)), unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination.

To summarize: the restrictions on aid to Communist countries are far stronger in the language already approved by Congress than in the language proposed in section 109. If we do not strike the language in section 109 we are going to set up conflicts in our attitude, give different directions to our executive branch of Government. I believe all should agree this is undesirable.

As an example of what I mean about restrictions, the bill proposes a simple

restriction which says—and I read from page 10, lines 10 and 11:

No economic assistance shall be furnished to any \* \* \* unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest \* \* \*

What does the existing law say, Mr. Chairman? It says that—

No assistance shall be furnished \* \* \* to any Communist country. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act unless the President finds and promptly reports to Congress that: (1) such assistance is vital to the security of the United States; (2) the recipient country is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy; and (3) such assistance will further promote the independence of the recipient country from international communism.

Surely there can be no argument that this kind of restriction on aid to Communist countries is more restrictive than the language proposed in this bill.

In addition, the language already on the books specifies specifically, by name, in section 620(f) those countries which qualify as Communist countries. So I urge favorable consideration of this amendment.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, in support of the gentleman's position, I point out here again there is certainly vagueness in the wording. For example, at the bottom of page 9 and the top of page 10 where reference is made to "materials, or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended."

It seems to me that language is so vague as to invite the confusion of which the gentleman speaks. Therefore, I urge the adoption of his amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

It is perfectly obvious that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey would greatly weaken the language contained in section 109(a) of the committee bill which says:

SEC. 109. (a) No assistance shall be furnished to any nation, whose government is based upon that theory of government known as communism under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, for any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials, or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

We do not allow any Presidential waiver whatsoever as far as military assistance to Communist countries is con-

cerned. Under the next provision, 109(b), we do permit a Presidential waiver on economic assistance, but on military assistance we have it airtight. This amendment would destroy what the committee felt is absolutely necessary, and that is to prevent the executive branch of the Government from providing any type of military assistance to a Communist country.

I hope that the members of the committee will vote down this amendment.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, as we indicated in the other amendment, I think it is pretty clear we should not be giving or selling arms even to friendly countries where this diverts resources from the primary purpose of foreign aid, let alone giving such assistance to the enemies of the United States.

Mr. PASSMAN. To the very able and distinguished Member from Maryland [Mr. Long] I ask this question: Do you concur with me that this amendment would weaken the committee language and allow a Presidential determination, but under the language of our bill it is absolutely airtight and under no conditions can any type of war materiel be provided?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I agree, and in my estimation, to do what the amendment proposes would in a sense be to lock the front door and leave the back door wide open.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to ask the chairman of the committee to what Communist countries do we give military aid at this point?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is not a question. Under existing law no military assistance can be given to any Communist country but under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey it could be done.

Mrs. KELLY. That was not the question. I asked you what laws are on the books which would allow the President to give military aid to any country known as a Communist country, referring specifically to the Foreign Assistance Act? There are none, and no military aid is being given to any Communist country.

Mr. Chairman, I take second place to no one in my determination to prohibit the sending of military arms to any country, as we say in this new time of cold war, known as a Communist nation.

Mr. Chairman, I was one of the authors of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1950, known as the Battle Act, which was the first major law designed to deny arms and aid to Communist countries. I have continued over the years in supporting our adherence to the provisions of that act and the operations which are carried on under that law. I had a great deal to do in the Committee on Foreign Affairs with reference to the other law referred to by my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], the Foreign Assistance Act, and I have par-



ticular reference to section 620(b) of that act which lists all those countries to which no aid is to be extended.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add that as a result of these laws, we have denied military equipment and other forms of aid to Communist countries for many years.

We all remember, of course, that President Eisenhower some years ago made a determination which allowed the sale of our farm surpluses to Poland. In a letter sent to the Committee on Foreign Affairs he explained fully his reasons for that action as a result thereof, Public Law 480, surplus commodities were subsequently sold to Poland. I must say this, that the Polish people have appreciated that gesture on our part and that the good will generated by those sales helped to demonstrate that the free people on the other side of the Iron Curtain had not forgotten them.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say at this time that the new language proposed in the bill before us does not improve our law prohibiting aid to Communist countries. Such aid is already prohibited and the bill simply creates confusion and uncertainty. For that reason, I support the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the gentleman from Louisiana has intimated that the existing law in some way provides a loophole which allows the President of the United States to provide military assistance of certain kinds to Communist countries. I would suggest that the loophole is a very small one. There are very tight restrictions and conditions under which the President can operate. It is inconceivable to me that he could meet those conditions and provide military assistance to Communist-controlled countries.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would think that a flat prohibition such as is presently contained in the law, with tight restrictions on the President, in cases vital to the national security, provides more than adequate protection. And, further, under no circumstance, as a practical matter, is any President of the United States going to supply military assistance to the Communist countries.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask my colleague from New Jersey if he would ever offer any amendment in order to permit the sale of military equipment to any country under the control of the Communist Party?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentlewoman will yield further, I would say that it would be inconceivable. It is for this reason that I am calling attention to the very strict requirements contained in the present law, which I think are advisable. I refer to sections 620(f).

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask any member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs if it is not true that in the authorizing legislation for our appropriation bill there is a phrase or clause which reads as follows:

No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to the government of any country unless the President determines that such country is not dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement.

You do give the President the right of determination, do you not?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I assume the gentleman from Louisiana does not believe I, as an individual, am in a position personally to give the President anything.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am not talking about you as an individual, I am reading the language in the public law. Do I read it correctly?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The Congress of the United States has spelled out, if the gentleman will refer to section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act, as to what we mean by Communist controlled. And it gives no leeway except in cases where it is felt it would be in the national security.

It is inconceivable that the President would find it essential to the national security to give military assistance to a Communist country.

Mr. PASSMAN. I agree. We would not expect the President to do so, but under the Foreign Assistance Act, as I read it, the President could make such an exception; could he not?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, I do not believe our President is a moron, and that he would—

Mr. PASSMAN. I did not say that. I am asking you the question: Could the President make such an exception?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would suggest that the limitations on the President's authority are very restrictive, as I have stated three times. We are not giving him any freedom, and in any case it is inconceivable that he would abuse his power by giving assistance to Communist-controlled countries.

Mr. PASSMAN. I repeat my question. Section 620(b) of the authorization act states:

No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to the government of any country unless the President determines that such country is not dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement.

Under that language the President could make a determination to extend assistance to a Communist country; could he not?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. It would seem to me that he could.

Mr. PASSMAN. But under the language of the bill presently under consideration, the President could not make this determination, could he?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I will say to the gentleman that I believe that is right, and that is the way I believe it should be.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, could I ask the gentleman the meaning of the language in Section 109:

No assistance shall be furnished to any nation, whose government is based upon that theory of government known as communism—

Does not that language mean that somebody has to make a determination as to whether that country is controlled by communism? Is it not appropriate that our own President should be given a reasonable amount of discretion to decide whether or not the country is controlled by communism? Surely the gentleman—

Mr. LONG of Maryland. But that is not the point that the gentleman is raising.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am not raising the point, the gentleman from Louisiana is raising the point. I am saying that somebody has to be given discretion to decide whether a country is controlled by Communists. The intimation is that the Committee on Appropriations is in some way depriving the President of that right.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. The point of this legislation is that once the determination is made that the country is a Communist country, then the President would have no discretion.

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to state in section 107(b), which this amendment proposes to delete, that we do provide that the President may make the determination and give economic aid. But we positively close the door for a similar determination by the President on military assistance. I certainly hope the Committee will vote down this amendment.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. We not only lock the front door; we lock the back door.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is what we want to do and what the language of the committee bill is designed to do.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Under the provisions of the proposed law, let me ask the gentleman: Who is to make the determination as to whether or not a country is under Communist domination?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I would assume, if the gentleman is directing the question to me, that it would be made by those who have the job of administering the law.

But the point we are determining here or raising here is not the question of who determines whether a country is Communist but what discretion the President has once that determination is made, and whether we want to take that discretion away from him.

Mr. ADAIR. Then this amendment would have the effect of taking the dis-

cretion away from the President and lodging it with some administrator down the line to determine whether a country is Communist?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is not so under the language of our bill. The administrators of this bill would not have the discretion to make such a determination.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a good deal of discussion about the front door being closed and the back door being opened. I think the point which has been made very clearly in the language as presently stated in proposed section 109(a) opens it absolutely wide open.

As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] just pointed out, the only prohibition indicated in section 109(a) relates to items, military items, contained on a list determined by the Administrator or AID pursuant to title I of the National Defense Assistance Control Act (22 U.S.C.A. 1611(a)).

Under that act, if the Administrator desires to declassify an item as military equipment, he may take it off the list which is provided under title I.

I think this just goes to point out the very serious dangers of taking up this kind of a provision on a bill that is primarily related to appropriations.

Actually, the door is open a great deal wider under section 109(a) than it is opened under any permissive provisions under any other act. I wonder if the Committee on Appropriations has considered this point and would care to comment on that.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will refer to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, I will quote, from the gentleman's own authorization bill, section 620(b):

No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to the government of any country unless the President determines that such country is not dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement.

That language provides that no assistance shall be furnished under this act to the government of any Communist country unless there is a Presidential determination that such country is not dominated, and so on.

Our language provides that no Communist country can be provided military equipment even if there is that determination.

Mr. TAFT. But for the provision to apply the military equipment must be military equipment listed on this list under title I of the Mutual Defense Control Act. The administration must make the determination. That list is authorized to be kept up to date and may be changed from time to time.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Does the gentleman maintain that this rather clearly defined list of implements of war is not sufficiently comprehensive to cover all implemented weapons of war?

Mr. TAFT. I presume there are new weapons and new items of military equipment that may be determined from time to time. I would like to have the

President and not the Administrator of the AID program have the discretion.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. You are talking about some day in the distant future when the meaning of what we are considering to be implements of war may have changed. At the present time this is a fairly comprehensive list.

Mr. PASSMAN. I certainly concur that this list should be updated as often as necessary. However, I, too, believe it is fairly comprehensive.

This committee felt that the President should not have that determination as to military assistance. If you want to make it more clearly defined as to what are strategic materials, then your committee should update the list of strategic materials.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman from Louisiana astounds me. Perhaps I do not understand but the gentleman apparently is saying that in effect the Appropriations Committee is trying to repeal section 620(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Let me read from it.

No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to the government of any country unless the President determines that this country is not dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement.

Is the gentleman from Louisiana saying, with respect to military equipment, that he does not feel the President should have any right or any discretion to decide whether a country is controlled by communism? I would think such a view would lend itself to an impossible situation.

Perhaps the Appropriations Committee has more wisdom than the President of the United States, but in the bill they have not replaced him as the entity that should make such a determination. I would think that the legislative record which we are building will make it impossible for anyone to move in any direction, yet it may well be important for the President to have the discretion to make a judgment with respect to a certain country so as to allow us to provide assistance, including military assistance, to that country.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I submit that the debate we have just heard fully illustrates how little some Members realize what is already in the law—in the Foreign Assistance Act.

Section 109 of the appropriation bill in effect, opens the door instead of tightening the existing law.

The gentleman from Louisiana has read only a part of section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act. He read only subsection (b) of that section. I suggest that the gentleman from Louisiana read also subsection (f) which has a more direct bearing on the issue at hand. Subsection (6) reads:

No assistance shall be furnished under this act . . . to any Communist country. . .

The words "no assistance under this act" mean both military and economic assistance. There are no "ifs" or "buts" about it. Both types of aid are already

prohibited, and the act spells out, as the gentleman from New Jersey has pointed out, the three conditions under which the President can waive this prohibition. Those three conditions are more stringent than any language proposed in the bill before us.

It pains me to see that it is the Members on the other side of the aisle who have led the fight to retain the language of existing law and who thereby have demonstrated confidence in our President. It is on this side of the aisle that we find people who apparently do not have sufficient confidence in our President to expect him to administer section 620(f) in a manner that serves the interests of our Nation.

Under the present act, no Communist country is receiving military assistance, and the gentleman from Louisiana knows that. This proposed language in the bill is window dressing. It can only create conflicts and confusion. It is unfortunate that we are dealing with legislation as important as this under these conditions.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that the language in the committee bill presently denies the right of determination to the President, whereas under your committee authorization bill language he can make a determination and provide military equipment to Communist countries? Is that not a statement of fact?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. As was so ably pointed out by the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Indiana, under section 109(a), it appears that the members of the Appropriations Committee are unable to identify who will make the determination as to what government is based upon the theory of government known as communistic and is ineligible for assistance. The gentleman from Indiana pointed out that very likely some Assistant Secretary will make the determination. Under the Foreign Assistance Act it is clearly the President who will make the determination whether or not assistance can indeed be furnished.

Mr. PASSMAN. Does the gentleman have the time to answer my question? You made a statement, but you did not answer my question: In the legislation under consideration the President is not given the right to make a determination, but under the Foreign Assistance Act the President can make a determination to provide military equipment to Communist countries. Is that a statement of fact?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Only if the President finds that the three criteria, carefully spelled out in the law, are met. And the three criteria in effect prohibit aid under any and all circumstances to any country which is a part of the communist conspiracy.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman for his confirmation.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. These criteria were accepted by the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Congress after careful study. I do not think we should willy-



nilly change them and possibly further bind the hands of the President. The President, under our Constitution, has the primary responsibility in foreign affairs. I do not think that he will abrogate these responsibilities and his powers to the Appropriations Committee. And I do not think that the Foreign Affairs Committee should abrogate its powers to the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act there are prohibitions against giving military assistance to any country under Communist domination. That is already on the books. I thank the gentleman in that regard.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, to assist my understanding of what the present law is and how this bill may change it, let us assume for purposes of our understanding that one Communist country attacked another and that it was in our national interest to help one of them. Can we under the present law give such military assistance, and under the bill as proposed can we give such military assistance?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the President makes a determination to the effect that the three criteria spelled out in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act are met, positive action would, of course, be possible.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly did not intend to get into this debate. In the first place, I think we have debated this long enough. We should bring this to a close and get it to the Senate, so we can get out of this Congress before Christmas. I do not know what we are getting into a lather over about this particular provision. This provision has been in every appropriation bill since 1963. All of the sudden some of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which I have a great respect and admiration for—I hope some day every single one of the members of it will become Secretary of State. I do. They deserve it. They work hard at it. All of the sudden, they feel that someone has invaded their jurisdiction. This provision has been in the bill since 1963. My good friend from Wisconsin, whom I love, came in here very dramatically and said the Senate has faith in the President.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I meant the gentleman on the other side of the aisle. I did not intend to refer to the other body.

Mr. CONTE. All right. The other side. But, in fact, it was the other body that kept the authorization bill in conference. For week after week after week on the arms sales question, because they had no faith. It was not the House of Representatives. It was the House of Representatives that was trying to dilute and weaken that provision.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I will be glad to yield shortly to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to say that I had not really intended to get into this debate. I knew there was some legislative difficulty in this bill. I think the gentleman had some hand in some of this. I must say I find the debate going on now disconcerting. I think the fact of the matter is that we have been aware of some of this for the first time, because we are aware of the fact that the Appropriations Committee did reach out and try to bring in new legislative areas. I cannot understand why the Subcommittee on Appropriations decided now it ought to become the legislative body with respect to foreign affairs.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to yield further. I have only a few seconds left.

Mr. Chairman, the point I am trying to make, in answer to the gentleman, is that this provision was in the bill since 1963. It may be that I agree it should not be in the bill, but why did the gentleman not come last year and tell me, or why did he not come before we sat down and marked up the bill and say, "I do not like that provision which has been in the bill since 1963"? Why did the gentleman from Wisconsin not take the floor last year or the year before or the year before that and say, "I do not like that provision in the bill. Take it out." Why wait until this late date in the session? A few members of the Foreign Affairs Committee may feel their feelings have been hurt. I can understand their feelings. I really can, but I feel we have to move on; we have to bring this session of the Congress to a close. I want to pass this bill today, and I want to go and sit with the Senate in conference and get this legislation passed.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman wondered why I had not opposed this provision in the past 3 years. Perhaps the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee were remiss. Nevertheless, it should not take 3 years for members of the Appropriations Committee to see the light and correct their ways and voluntarily strike the legislative provisions from the Appropriation Act.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's concern about going home for Thanksgiving at least. It seems to me the simplest way to do it is to drop some of the controversial legislative language which is in contradiction with language already on the books. It seems to me if we could have had a point of order made against this, we would not have had to get into a prolonged conference with the other body on the merits of this legislation, which surely we are going to do, as the gentleman indicated, and as has happened in the past.

I would think, if they could only see that they do not have all the wisdom,

that there are provisions perhaps even better than the language proposed in this bill, and we might expedite the proceedings, and even now get a bill through.

It is for that reason I sought unanimous consent to have certain amendments considered en bloc. I regret that is not the case.

Mr. CONTE. If I may say so, there are only three new amendments in this bill that were added by the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. All the other sections of this bill were in the old language, in the old bill. There is nothing new here other than that. There are only three new amendments, and two of those are with respect to the selling of sophisticated weapons of war to basically Latin America and Africa.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Is this not the situation: The committee has incorporated this language, which is a recommendation to the House. The Committee on Appropriations is not trying to run things. If the House does not like this language, the House can take it out.

Let us vote.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman is absolutely correct. This language was adopted by the House before, not by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I take a little pride in the section 620 (f) of the Foreign Assistance Act, because I was the author of it a few years ago—about 5 years ago, I believe.

I just want the chairman of the subcommittee to assure me that this will not weaken that section one bit.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is the opinion of the members of the committee that it will not in any way weaken your language. It really will make it stronger, in the opinion of the members of the committee.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I agree with the chairman of the subcommittee. It will strengthen rather than weaken your language.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, it took me 2 years to get this section in. I should like to see it kept in. I do not want to see it weakened a bit. It has been effective in the law.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. If I remember correctly—and I stand to be corrected—what the Members are arguing over, in trying to do this, is trying to make a change in the gentleman's language, which the House adopted a few years ago.

Mr. CASEY. I will not tolerate that, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to say, as the sponsor of the amendment, I am trying to protect the language the gentleman from Texas proposed, which is now section 620(f) of the law. Under the proposal of section 109 there would be a relaxation of the limitations on economic assistance. That section merely says that no economic assistance shall be furnished unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest.

Without any doubt, this would be a watering down of the language presently on the books.

Mr. CASEY. The gentleman will recall that the language which I offered, which was adopted by the House, was to prohibit any and all assistance, and to make sure it was understood I listed the countries, but not limited to those countries we considered Communist. The other body put in the discretion with reference to the President making the determination, which follows under subsections (g) and (h) of section 620.

All I want to know—and I want a firm answer—is whether this will weaken this section or give more latitude and more discretion in the giving of aid to Communist countries?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CASEY. I will yield to any Member who can answer.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Without any question, it will weaken the language with respect to economic assistance. There is only one limitation proposed in section 109.

Mr. CASEY. The gentleman says it will weaken the language?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It will weaken the language. It simply says that no economic assistance shall be furnished unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest. That is the only limitation, instead of the three limitations against all assistance, military and economic, in the present law.

Mr. CASEY. I do not want it weakened, myself.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say to the gentleman from Texas, under section 107(a) relating to military, your language would be greatly strengthened. Section 107(b) relating to economic assistance, is, in my opinion, the same as that contained in your amendment.

The gentleman would be greatly fortified, in my candid opinion, for his years of hard work, if he votes against the amendment.

I believe the great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations concurs, and also the gentleman from Massachusetts now on his feet [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say—and I believe the gentleman will agree with me on this—in regard to military assistance the language in the

appropriation bill is much stronger and in regard to economic assistance I think the language is about equal. In both provisions in regard to economic assistance, the President has discretionary power.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. For the legislative record if for nothing else, we are misrepresenting the facts. If we should accept section 109, it would be without doubt putting less strings on economic assistance to Communist countries, because the only limitation on the President would be that it was not contrary to our national interest instead of the three-point limitation in existing law. I do not see how any contention can be made that our insistence with the present law is stronger than their law is. By the wildest stretch of the imagination it would be hard to contend such a thing if that is the position of the gentleman from Louisiana as I understand it.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time—and it will be very brief—merely to take advantage of the development made by my colleague and fellow member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], because in the argument yesterday afternoon with many of my colleagues of like mind they were astounded to learn that some of this language has been in the bill for some time. We have been voting for it every year if we wanted to vote for foreign aid. I want to state here so the RECORD is very clear, there are items in this bill which I do not approve. One of them is this section. But there are other important things that have to be done in relation to foreign assistance and foreign aid which in weighing out the costs are even more urgent. So we have had to bear with this. But make no mistake about it, I do not approve of this language and tend to agree with the arguments made by the gentleman from New Jersey and those who support his view. What I am doing now is rubbing it in a little bit with some of my colleagues who yesterday told me what a horrible piece of legislation the committee bill was. We had only two committee amendments in the subcommittee markup.

There are very important issues in this bill that are at stake, as I see it. I will keep my eye clearly on the issue during the debate this afternoon. To me the issues have to do with military assistance to Latin America and Africa. I want to say to this distinguished Committee of the Whole that I am going to do everything I can to resist the State Department, or any other agency of our Government, if they allow prestigious materials of warfare to go to countries that cannot afford to bear the cost, and whose people are living at just barely the level of subsistence and in a state that has brought about the revolutions that we are hoping to prevent. And do not tell me they are going to get it some place else. That is exactly what happened in Indonesia some time ago. Over \$1.5 billion of Russian materials of war went to Indonesia and

we had but a small advisory mission there.

Our military assistance program was primarily a training program. May I say to everyone present that I do not oppose military assistance, but I do oppose military assistance of the kind that has been given in too many cases. I will support military assistance especially for training and basic internal security.

Let me remind you that today in Indonesia the greatest recovery problem we have in the postrevolutionary period in that part of the world is the fact that they have \$1.5 billion that has to be paid back to the Russians. They are trying to figure out methods of repayment. We are trying to figure out a way to get back in there with economic assistance. But at no time did we provide significant military assistance except training. They received it from other countries. And look at what happened. I do not believe the taxpayers of this country want to support this kind of arms race.

I also want to say while I am on my feet that I believe such things as operation and maintenance money for decrepit and obsolete weapons systems is a crime, because all it is doing is supporting a privileged military class and putting a further burden on some of these poor countries. I am not going to recite the names of the countries, for obvious reasons, but I want everyone within the sound of my voice and all of the foreign diplomats in this city to hear what I am saying, because that is the way the people in this country, in my judgment, feel. I am confident this House shares that view.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, for 8 consecutive years I have voted against the various foreign aid bills. I have not always done so with a clear conscience for within the program there are certain programs which are doing a great job for a minimum amount of money. But I must vote on the program as a whole. I have, in evaluating the value received as compared to the cost, found the program wanting. In 1951 and 1952 I was in Germany and there I saw a program which was succeeding beyond our fondest dreams. I looked with pride at the signs saying "Hier hilft der Marshall Plan." We had a definite goal. We accomplished that goal and then terminated that program. Our goals now are not so definite nor does there seem to be any time in sight when the foreign aid program will come to an end.

Also, today we are beset with many problems which require more than ever a priority directed spending of available funds. As we establish our priorities we must very carefully assess what this Nation is able to do and what it cannot do. We must also take into consideration the many legitimate demands for money here in our own country. I cannot help but believe that for us to do abroad for



citizens of other countries that which we fail to do here or can do here in this country for our own citizens is neither being wise nor prudent. It is being foolhardy.

The committee points out some of the results claimed by the Agency for International Development. It says that over 15 million textbooks have been distributed abroad. In America there are thousands of schools using outdated textbooks. It says that over 25,000 classrooms have been built abroad. In my congressional district there are areas where we have a desperate shortage of classrooms and where we do have adequate classrooms there is an unusually heavy local tax burden. Over 19 million students are enrolled in assisted schools abroad. In Indiana we have elementary, secondary schools and institutions of higher learning clamoring for funds which just are not available. It is pointed out that over 60,000 dwelling units have been built abroad. One of the most pressing problems confronting America is its housing shortage and every proposal to do something to help brings forth cries of dismay—some of them coming from the very people who support the foreign aid programs.

The report tells us that over 800,000 tons of fertilizer nutrient were provided abroad in 1966. I have farmers threatened with bankruptcy because of high costs of items such as fertilizer and low incomes. The report also shows that nearly 100 million people benefited from new water supply facilities, almost 800,000 new acres were irrigated and more than 600,000 acres of land reclaimed abroad during 1966. Well I have towns and cities in my district which cannot get Federal help for their own water supplies and sewage systems because there simply is not enough money to go around. In this country we have people in the West who desperately need irrigation projects financed and millions of acres which could be reclaimed which we are neglecting.

The report points out that in 1966 almost 20,000 firms abroad have received industrial credit loans. How many small business loan applications have been turned down in Indiana just because there was not enough money to go around?

Mr. Chairman, as much as we may want to do these things for all people, as much compassion as we may have for the people of the developing countries, as much as we may feel for their problems, we simply cannot afford to do these things. I cannot vote for a program which looks after needs abroad when I am forced by reason of fiscal problems to vote against, or for reductions in, domestic programs of the same nature which would take care of desperate needs at home.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it was my good fortune to be brought up to be a good loser. I was told by my father that one could win more friends in defeat if one were a good loser than one could win as a winner and that the best way to lose all one's friends was to be an arrogant winner.

Mr. Chairman, I was defeated yesterday and today I know I occupy the hum-

ble place of a loser. I fought for the honor and the prerogatives of the committee of my assignment. And, I might say that I do not have a better friend in this body and that there is no Member of Congress for whom I have a deeper affection, than the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. But yesterday, when he was reaching out, the great statesman that he is, to take over the prerogatives of my committee, I had to fight even my dear friend. And, Mr. Chairman, I was right. But I was beaten. The side on which I fought lost 190 to 200. That meant that foreign policy responsibility passed to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I was not going to raise my voice today. I fully realized that would be a gesture in futility since the great Committee on Appropriations had taken over the legislative functions of the defunct Committee on Foreign Affairs. So, I was silenced, sidelined as it were. But now that I observe Members are raising their voices and their tempers seem frayed I venture to suggest a cooling-off period.

There has never been a President of the United States who did not regard the security of his country as a sacred obligation. Our country had a great President when I was a young man, and I am proud and I feel honored to serve in this Chamber with his grandson. I have served in the Congress under four Presidents, and with each the security of our country was an obligation deep rooted in mind and heart.

No, Mr. Chairman, let us not take away the power of the President of the United States to make decisions in foreign affairs, vital determinations that must be made, and often quickly.

Suppose tomorrow there were a change of government in Cuba, a new government had come into being, and that again the happiness of liberty had come to the people of the island of Cuba. Who would recognize the new government? How long would it be, how many dreary weeks and months, until our doors were reopened because we had deprived the President of the United States of the power to note a change in status quo?

Mr. Chairman, there is no area of greater delicacy than that of foreign affairs. Foreign policy is not a fabric that can be woven in the passions of legislative debate.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Yes, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for yielding and I wish to reciprocate fully, in view of the compliment that the gentleman paid to me, and to say that we have been friends for many, many years. We have lived in the same hotel. We have counseled together often. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois knows that I have the most profound respect for the gentleman, one of my great friends.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate how the distinguished gentleman feels. But it is not entirely the fault of the gentleman

from Louisiana with respect to this legislation. I have great respect for the great Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on which the distinguished gentleman from Illinois serves, but there were certain circumstances that made it necessary, and the majority of the members of the whole committee felt that we should bring out this bill which seems to be so distasteful to some members.

I hope the gentleman will not take it as a personal reflection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Not at all. The best of friends cannot always be in agreement and in a democratic society that is as it should be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could reach some agreement on the remainder of time on this amendment and all amendments thereto.

We have been debating on this amendment for approximately 2 hours. I understand there are some 15 or 16 other amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:25 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is it in order to move the previous question on this amendment now, inasmuch as we have had considerable debate on it, and I have been trying to receive recognition for approximately half an hour, but now I am willing to forgo my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the moving of the previous question is not in order in the Committee of the Whole.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] for 1 minute.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to ask for the privilege of revising and extending my remarks.

I would like to direct the attention of the gentleman from New Jersey to his remarks of yesterday, when he at least insinuated that I was dense, and could not understand, and then today the gentleman from Wisconsin made the statement that it takes the Committee on Appropriations 3 years to understand what is in this bill.

In other words, the striped pants boys seem to have all the intelligence, seem to have all the answers.

I want to say that I commend the Committee on Appropriations for writing some language in this bill which can be understood.

I want to say to the gentleman from New Jersey that the amendments he has offered would have done nothing but detract from the bill, and weaken the bill. Yesterday the gentleman wanted to take out Cuba, and now the gentleman wants to take out everything else.

This, as has been stated by the Committee on Appropriations, is for emphasis that we mean business; that we do not



want to deal with Cuba, and that we do not want to give any help or assistance to any of the other Communist nations, and those that have broken diplomatic relations with the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I simply do not understand the arguments that have been made here that the Committee on Appropriations is legislating.

Chairman Dingley of Maine wrote in 1896:

The House in Committee of the Whole has the right to refuse to appropriate for any object, either in whole or in part, even though that object may be authorized by law. That principle of limitation has been sustained so repeatedly that it may be regarded as a part of the parliamentary law of the Committee of the Whole.

Further, Asher C. Hinds, in *Hinds Precedents* in 1908, stated that the appropriation may interfere with Executive discretion only in a negative way.

That is all that we are proposing to do here.

The gentleman from Illinois asked what would happen if the Government of Cuba should change very suddenly. Well, if it changed as much as the gentleman hoped that it would, then it would no longer be a Communist country, and we would have no reason to worry about it in that particular case.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that in my opinion what we are talking about is academic as far as foreign military assistance is concerned. There are \$365 million appropriated in this bill, but under the defense appropriation there is probably a sum in excess of \$500 million.

The restrictions in this bill apply so far as foreign assistance is concerned, and when you take the lion's share of military assistance out of this bill as we have done and put it in defense appropriations, you are removing every single restriction that we have under the foreign assistance bill. We are just debating among ourselves about restrictions which do not apply under the Defense Appropriation Act.

So far as that sum in excess of \$500 million is concerned, there are no restrictions whatever in my opinion. We have let this tremendous appropriation ride through on the defense appropriation where it cannot be touched and now we are engaging in an academic exercise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Frelinghuysen amendment for the reason that it would give more delegated authority to the executive branch of Government.

It will be interesting to see when we get to the Latin American phase of this bill how much discretionary authority some of the Members of the House will want to give to the executive branch of the Government in the sale of military equipment to that area of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

I might say that I, for one, have every confidence in our President. If that section of the bill will be modified by an amendment giving some discretionary authority to the President so far as the sales of military equipment are concerned, I would favor it.

I want to say at this time I deeply regret that the gentleman from Missouri took offense at my observation regarding the prevailing knowledge of what is in this bill and of what is and has been in the law. I gather he was also not pleased with my explanation regarding the reason why some of these provisions have been allowed to remain in previous appropriation bills.

I admire the gentleman very much and I have high regard for him. I must confess, however, that some members of the Committee on Appropriations did advise me that in their opinion there was a lot of "garbage" in the bill before us. That is not my expression; I am simply repeating what I was told.

I would hope therefore that these members would voluntarily put some check on the extraneous material which repeatedly finds its way into the appropriation bills.

In closing, I just want to say that section 109 of this bill, that part of it which deals with the military assistance, may be stronger on the surface than the language in the Foreign Assistance Act. Unfortunately, the bill does not identify who shall make the determination that a country is Communist and therefore ineligible for assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I support the committee bill as it is, without the amendment.

The chief reason I have taken the well of the House is because of the legislative situation. Remarks have been made here about this bill repealing previous law. Of course, those of you who are lawyers know that that is not so. This provision does not expressly repeal the other law and neither does it impliedly repeal the law. Unless we do something here on the floor of the House to strongly show that repeal is intended—and nothing so far has shown that—the result would be that if we pass the committee bill, the older law would still exist and the most restrictive of the two provisions would apply. That is what the law will be. It will not repeal the old law at all and the requirements of the old law will still exist.

As I say, the chief reason I have taken the well is that I favor the law as it was brought out by the committee and its added new restrictions. It does not repeal the other law at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] to close debate.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 114. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay in whole or in part any assessments, arrearages, or dues of any member of the United Nations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: On page 12, line 8, strike out lines 8 through 12, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to apologize to any member of this Committee who feels that he has been personally insulted or offended by what I may have said during the debate. Some of the subjects are quite difficult for me to comprehend, and certainly some of the lines of argument, but I did not mean to cast aspersions on any individual Member. I refer specifically to the comments of the gentleman from Missouri in that connection. My admiration for his sagacity, intelligence, and integrity ranks with all the other Members of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would eliminate section 114 from the bill. This amendment is very simple. The section I propose to delete is very simple and my amendment is very simple.

This language of the bill proposes that no foreign aid funds are to be used for any assessments, arrearages, or dues of any member of the U.N. It reads as follows:

SEC. 114. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay in whole or in part any assessments, arrearages, or dues of any member of the United Nations.

I would like to suggest, first, that I would doubt very much if it would be possible, even if anyone wished to, for appropriations by Congress to be used for direct purposes such as this.

I would like to suggest also that this basic problem has been discussed in some detail in the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee. Language has been agreed upon in the act just signed into law, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967. Let me read it. I realize time is short. It is section 620(u) of the Foreign Assistance Act.

In any decision to provide or continue to provide any program of assistance to any country under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, there shall be taken into account the status of the country with respect to its dues assessments and other obligations to the United Nations, and where such country is delinquent with respect to any such obligations, for purposes of the first sentence of Article XIX of the U.N. Charter the President shall furnish the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report setting forth the assurance given by the Government of the country concerned of the paying of its arrearages and placing its payments and obligations on a current basis, or a full explanation of the



unusual or exceptional circumstances which render it economically incapable of giving such assurance.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, this is an adequate and appropriate reaction on our part to the fact that some of the United Nations members have not paid their dues or regular assessments and are in arrearage. However, to suggest that in some way we can bring pressure by not appropriating funds is surely to miss the point entirely. No one is suggesting that funds could or should be used directly for that purpose. In the present law, recently enacted, is a provision saying that in giving any aid, consideration must be given to whether the recipient countries are in arrears. That is one of the factors which should be taken into consideration. It is aimed at any indirect subsidy, which is presumably also the intention of the Appropriations Committee in the language of the bill before us.

I would hope that calling the attention to the very specific requirement that the President take this into consideration would allay any suspicions that perhaps in one way or another the United States is subsidizing the assessments of other U.N. members. I can assure the Committee, so far as I know, that no such subsidy is presently being undertaken or is contemplated.

I think the maximum we should expect is that consideration be taken as to whether more could not be done by these countries. If they make little effort, it might be a factor against giving aid to these countries.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I am a little puzzled about the point. If I gather the point of the gentleman, it is that there is nothing in the law at the present time or in practice that calls for the paying of dues or assessments of any nation in the United Nations, and that therefore this is not necessary.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That is not my point. If the gentleman listened, he would have heard I have very specific reference to the importance of the executive branch of the Government taking into consideration whether any nation is in arrears in its dues to the U.N.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

(On request of Mr. JONES of Missouri, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, is there any prohibition in the Foreign Assistance Act prohibiting the United States from using funds to pay the arrearages?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the gentleman, if he would read the bill closely, there is no prohibition in the language in the bill. The bill does not provide such prohibition. There is no prohibition that aid given to a country cannot be used by that country to pay its assessments.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman, the gentleman evidently does not read any closer than the gentleman intimates I do not read, because it says that "none of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act may be used to pay in whole or in part any assessments, arrearages," and so on.

The reason I say that is, I think, in fact, we are paying some of these assessments to some of these international organizations, under a subterfuge, by assessing a nation four one-hundredths of 1 percent and permitting them to put people on the payroll in excess of the amount of money they are paying. That is the thing I have been objecting to. I have tried to call it to the attention of this body yesterday, but evidently some people could not get it into their minds what I was trying to reach.

I do not want us to be suckers any more.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say, if the gentleman thinks this language is reaching to the problem of whether an individual country is paying an adequate U.N. assessment, this language will not correct the scale of assessments in the U.N. It would not prohibit any aid going to any country that we may think is not paying an adequate assessment to the U.N.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No. It says that none of this shall be used to pay the assessment of dues. It does not say we cannot give aid to countries in arrears.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say no one is contemplating paying assessment of dues.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is not legislation in an appropriation bill. This is nothing more than a limitation, and by this limitation we simply preclude the executive from paying for the assessments, arrearages, or dues of any member of the United Nations. We hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 116. No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country that sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to North Vietnam any of the items mentioned in subsection 107(a) of this Act.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 13, strike all of lines 4 through 8, and insert the following:

"SEC. 116. No loans, credits, guaranties, or grants or other assistance shall be furnished under this or any other Act, including the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which sells or furnishes to North Vietnam, or which permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from North Vietnam, any equipment, materials, or commodities, so long as North Vietnam is governed by a Communist regime.

"Notwithstanding section 640 of the For-

eign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, no defense articles or defense services shall be acquired from, or provided to, any such country by any means under this or any other Act. Nothing in this or any other Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive these provisions."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana reserves a point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. This amendment has been before the House twice before, but I want to give some of the Members another opportunity to vote on it, particularly the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who seemed to think that the language in some of the previous provisions of this bill was not tight enough. That was the argument they made a while ago. I want to give them a real, good, tight provision to vote on.

This is the amendment which was adopted when the foreign giveaway authorization bill was before the House. When the conference report came back, it had been stricken. It was offered again, and failed by only four votes on a rollcall vote in the House.

Now I seek to give the Members who voted against it on both sides of the aisle an opportunity to correct the mistake that they made previously only a few days ago.

This amendment goes much further than the pending bill in clamping down on the free world countries that are trading with the Communists of North Vietnam. It provides that no loans, credits, guaranties, grants, or other assistance shall be furnished under this or any other act. It provides that no defense articles or defense services shall be acquired from or provided to any country that ships the sinews of war to the Communists of North Vietnam.

The Members are well acquainted with this amendment. I am not going to belabor the point. I want to say once again that 63 British ships alone have delivered thousands of tons of supplies to the North Vietnamese thus far this year. In all conscience, this must be stopped. Anything less is a betrayal of our fighting men in that brutal war.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana will state his point of order.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment goes further than the provision in the bill, and refers to funds provided in this or any other act presently on the statute books.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GROSS. Very briefly, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the present Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union ruled as follows:

The section of the bill to which the amendment is offered is legislation which has been permitted to remain by waiver of points of

order. Such legislative provisions can be perfected by germane amendments.

The Chair then ruled:

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri is germane and therefore overrules the point of order.

I would say to the Chairman, this is an amendment providing a limitation to a provision of this bill which has been made in order by a rule waiving points of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Iowa correctly states the ruling of the Chair on yesterday. That ruling indicated that the Chair held in order an amendment which was ruled to be a perfecting amendment to a paragraph in the bill that was conceded to be legislation on an appropriation bill but on which points of order had been waived in a rule adopted by the House.

The Chair holds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is additional legislation on this bill not covered by the points of order that were waived.

The Chair holds that the amendment adds additional legislation on an appropriation bill; and therefore sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: On page 13, line 4, strike out lines 4 through 8, inclusive.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike out section 116 from the bill. I offer this amendment, Mr. Chairman, because—and again I call attention to the obvious—there is language already on the books, in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, namely, section 620 (n), which covers the case of North Vietnam. I might say it covers it with a considerable degree of particularity. It is in fact far broader than the language proposed in this bill. Let me read it. It reads as follows:

(n) In view of the aggression of North Vietnam, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country which has failed to take appropriate steps, not later than sixty days after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966—

(A) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting to North Vietnam—

(i) any items of economic assistance,  
(ii) any items which are, for the purposes of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, or items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, or  
(iii) any other equipment, materials, or commodities; and

(B) to prevent ships or aircraft under its registry from transporting any equipment, materials, or commodities from North Vietnam.

Let me make two points: One is that the language already on the books is

broader than the bill's proposal to limit assistance to countries which provide strategic aid to North Vietnam. It also limits aid to countries which are providing economic assistance to that country.

The gentleman from Iowa offered an amendment which would tighten up the language now contained in 620(n). I grant that his language tightens up the present law. There are certain loopholes in it. But I suggest that the committee thoroughly considered whether there should be an absolute prohibition or not. The committee decided against an absolute prohibition, and provided that if a country were taking appropriate steps within 60 days, that there should be no automatic prohibition of assistance to that country. The committee felt that in the process of tightening up we might be doing damage to friends of ours, or to those whom we have been aiding and who are doing their level best to comply with our restrictions.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the present language, which applies not only to strategic materials but also to economic assistance, will be satisfactory to those who feel reference should be made to trade with North Vietnam. I would suggest that the reference is not appropriate in an appropriation bill. The language already enacted is entirely appropriate and is even more comprehensive than the language proposed in section 116.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The gentleman speaks of a loophole in the provisions written into this appropriation bill by the Committee on Appropriations. His amendment would provide a far bigger loophole in that under section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 it provides for discretionary authority to the President not to invoke any restrictions. Of course it would not be invoked. I was interested earlier to hear the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] speaking on the subject of the Battle Act. I do not know of a better act that has been presented to the Congress in my time on that subject, but it has never been used and it will never be used as long as we have willy-nilly Presidents who refuse to invoke the penalties provided for in the Battle Act. I do not recall that the Battle Act has been invoked on a single occasion. And, it has been on the statute books for some 15 or 17 years.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Iowa, but I want to ask the gentleman one question: Can the gentleman name any country that our country—any Communist country—has given military equipment as outlined in this bill at this point?

Mr. GROSS. I suspect that Yugoslavia might be one. But, that is not the point. What we are trying to do here—

Mrs. KELLY. I want the record to show—

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute. What we are trying to do here is to get at and

penalize those so-called free world friends who supply the Communists of North Vietnam and Castro's Cuba. That is what some of us are trying to do.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Wisconsin said he hoped that Members of the House would read the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. If they do that, there will probably be more legislation of this type contained in the appropriation bills, because you can scarcely flip a page of that act without finding discretionary authority vested in the President. It is a travesty in that respect.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mrs. KELLY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Iowa that the Mutual Security and Control Act was not operated properly. However, I must say I feel that the prohibitions against military equipment and assistance to Communist countries was prohibited as a result of this act. The only one on which I will say I agree with the gentleman is insofar as Yugoslavia is concerned and what happened there? We were kicked out when we endeavored to live up to the operations of the Mutual Security Control Act, because they refused us the opportunity to review what they were doing with the equipment which we had furnished.

Mr. GROSS. I do not care whether it is guns, butter, wonder drugs, or what it may be that the treacherous British, Poles, Greeks, and others are shipping into North Vietnam. They are contributing to the killing of Americans, they are contributing to the patching up of the Vietcong wounded to return and kill more Americans. This is what I am opposed to. I hope that some day a Congress of the United States will put a stop to it by invoking penalties upon these so-called friends who are helping the enemy kill and wound thousands of Americans in a war in Vietnam.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I ask for a vote thereon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 117. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended shall be available for assistance to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such availability is essential to the national interest of the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: On page 13, line 9, strike out lines 9 through 14, inclusive.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, again I rise to offer an amendment striking a section of this bill. The section



I propose to strike is section 117 which reads as follows:

Sec. 117. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, shall be available for assistance to the United Arab Republic, unless the President determines that such availability is essential to the national interest of the United States.

I do so because the Congress has already expressed itself in no uncertain language with respect to the problem brought about by the actions of the United Arab Republic. True, Mr. Chairman, the language incorporated into the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967 does not refer specifically to the United Arab Republic. But under existing law it would be far broader than that.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to read this policy statement of section 102 of the act:

It is further the sense of the Congress that in any case in which any foreign country has severed diplomatic relations with the United States, the President should suspend assistance to such country under this or any other Act, including any program designed to complement assistance under this Act (such as sales of agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954). When diplomatic relations are resumed, a further study should be made on a country-by-country basis to determine whether United States foreign policy objectives would be served by extending assistance under this or any other Act, including any program designed to complement such assistance.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, language as broad as that would lead to an automatic suspension of any assistance to the United Arab Republic, whereas the language incorporated in section 117 gives the President discretion—and I am surprised that the committee would give the President this discretion since they seem to doubt the way he would use it so frequently.

The President could give aid to the United Arab Republic under section 117. Even though diplomatic relations may not have been resumed with that country. Naturally I would assume there would be no move by the President to try to provide assistance to Egypt under such circumstances.

There is also language in section 620(t) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1967, which would prohibit aid to countries which have broken diplomatic relations with us. It reads as follows:

(t) No assistance shall be furnished under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, in or to any country which has severed or hereafter severs diplomatic relations with the United States or with which the United States has severed or hereafter severs diplomatic relations, unless (1) diplomatic relations have been resumed with such country and (2) agreements for the furnishing of such assistance or the making of such sales, as the case may be, have been negotiated and entered into after the resumption of diplomatic relations with such country.

The importance of the language in section 102 and section 620(t) also should be enough to satisfy those who, for one reason or another, are anxious that the United Arab Republic does not receive

assistance—and I might say that I am included in that number.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I believe it is worth pointing out that when the Committee on Foreign Affairs was writing language to deal with this subject, we gave it the very closest scrutiny and attention. I also believe it is fair to point out that in this respect, when the language was first presented during the markup period of the bill, a special committee was designated to attempt to draw language dealing with this very sensitive diplomatic question.

As a result of that very great effort, language was drawn, and it was drawn not only through legislative efforts, but in consultation with members of the executive department. The language now in the bill is very inclusive, it is entirely appropriate, and greatly superior, as the gentleman from New Jersey has pointed out, to the language proposed here.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that the Committee on Foreign Affairs would welcome any suggestions, at the time of the markup of the authorization bill, as to language that would be appropriate in circumstances like this, a delicate question like our relationship with other countries should not be considered in an appropriation bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe I should state that this particular language was put in the bill by the other body. It has been carried in this bill during the 2 previous years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 13, line 14, strike the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this Act or any predecessor Act shall be made available to the State of Israel until the Government of that country provides full and complete reparations for the killing and wounding of more than 100 United States citizens in the wanton, unprovoked attack in June 1967 by Israel's military aircraft and torpedo boats on the United States naval vessel, the *Liberty*."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment and will reserve the point of order so that the gentleman from Iowa may explain his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is self-explanatory. It simply

means that none of the funds provided in this bill shall go to the State of Israel until that Government provides full and fair reparations for the more than 100 U.S. servicemen who were killed and wounded—I believe some 34 or 35 were killed and another 75 or 80 were wounded—in the unprovoked attack by Israel's military forces upon the U.S.S. *Liberty*.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. It is my understanding that the State of Israel has offered to make reparations in connection with this regrettable incident. Does the gentleman dispute that?

Mr. GROSS. They have at least gone through the motions of apologizing for the attack.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Is it not true that they have undertaken to make reparations and are offering to make reparations when it is ascertained as to what they might be?

I gather it will take some time to discover what the costs of the injuries may be determined to be and they should be allowed a decent time in which to do that. I do not think they have refused to accept their obligations.

Mr. GROSS. Under the terms of this bill there are several million dollars made available to Israel. My amendment will not deny them that money if, and when, they make full reparation for their attack on our vessel and its crew.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Is it not the purpose of the gentleman's amendment simply to give a slap in the face to a friendly country that has already admitted it made a mistake and has offered to make full reparations?

Mr. GROSS. Let them pay those reparations and I do not want them to use our money for that purpose.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman if he is willing to give them time and not to insult somebody gratuitously.

Mr. GROSS. This is not an insult. The gentleman from Maryland well knows that this is not an insult. Let them first compensate those to whom they caused so much pain and anguish. As a matter of fact, as I said yesterday, they should be denied a dollar of credit or anything else until this matter is settled.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. If this is not an insult, I would like to hear from the gentleman what he regards as an insult.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder how you would feel if you were the father of one of the boys who was killed or maimed on that U.S. naval vessel. I do not know what kind of descriptive word you would use to express your feeling in that connection—or perhaps you do not have any feeling with respect to these young men who were killed, wounded and maimed, or their families.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Is it not true that many times we fire on our own troops in Vietnam and men are killed? Do not these things happen in war? Is there anything we can do to bring these men back to life? We all regret it but

does this excuse an attempt, through the gentleman's amendment, to give affront to a friendly country?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is making a most odious comparison and he ought to be the first to acknowledge it. We do not deliberately fire on our own troops in Vietnam unless a commander of troops calls for it. Our servicemen in Vietnam are killed and wounded by enemy fire. To try to compare the cause of our casualties in Vietnam with the casualties suffered in the attack on the Liberty comes dangerously close to characterizing Israel as an enemy. I have not said Israel is an enemy and I hope no one else will attempt to make such a comparison.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana insist on his point of order?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment goes beyond the appropriation of funds in this and other preceding acts.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is clearly a limitation upon an appropriation bill; that the funds not be expended for the stated purpose unless the limitations are met.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered is germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. (Mr. PRICE of Illinois.) The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] refers to funds provided in this act or any predecessor act. It covers an area not covered by the amendment in the bill.

In the opinion of the Chair, it is clearly additional legislation and is not germane to the amendment in the bill.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I just take this opportunity to refer to the question of the gentleman from Iowa of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] as to whether or not he has feelings. I know Mr. LONG did not want to say this, himself, but he has a son who has served in the 101st Airborne Division in Vietnam, who was wounded twice, and received a Silver Star. I think this should answer the question as to whether the gentleman from Maryland has feelings for the parents of our young men in the armed services.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 119. The President is directed to withhold economic assistance in an amount equivalent to the amount spent by any underdeveloped country (as defined on page 142 of part 2 of the printed hearings of the House Committee on Appropriations on the fiscal year 1968 Foreign Assistance Appropriations) other than Greece, Turkey, Iran, Israel, the Republic of China, the Philip-

pin, and Korea for the purchase of sophisticated weapons systems such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes from any country.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHELAN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COHELAN: On page 14, immediately after line 16, insert the following:

"Sec. 120. None of the funds appropriated or made available by this Act for carrying out titles I, II, and VI of chapter 2, and chapter 4, of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used for financing, in whole or in part, any capital assistance project as estimated to cost in excess of \$1,000,000, until the head of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of such Act has received and taken into consideration a report on the review of the proposed capital assistance project, conducted by the Controller of such agency with such assistance from other divisions of such agency as he may request, which report shall set forth the Controller's views, comments, and such recommendations as he may deem appropriate with respect to the adequacy of the justification, feasibility studies, and prospects for effective utilization of such project."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have an amendment which I intend to offer to section 119. I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from California would follow that, for it provides for an additional section. I wonder if the amendment to section 119 should not be considered first.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. Will the gentleman from California withhold his amendment?

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I withhold the amendment.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and six Members are present, a quorum.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BINGHAM

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BINGHAM: On page 14, lines 7 through 16 strike all of section 119 and substitute the following:

"Sec. 119. In extending economic assistance to any underdeveloped country (as defined on page 142 of part 2 of the printed hearings of the House Committee on Appropriations on the fiscal year 1968 foreign assistance appropriations) the President is directed to take into consideration the extent to which the country in question is purchasing sophisticated weapons systems, such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes not needed for external defense, and to withhold economic assistance to the extent that he finds the purpose of such economic assistance will be defeated by the purchase of such unnecessary sophisticated weapons systems."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in some hesitation on this amendment,

because I have great admiration for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], whose language I believe appears in section 119. I know what the gentleman is trying to do and I agree with his objectives, but I do not think the language as it appears in the bill is well calculated to achieve these objectives. I think on the contrary it may do a great deal of damage to the economic and technical assistance programs which are provided for in this act. Let me quickly explain why I believe that is the case.

First, there is a list of countries that are excepted from the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, specifically Greece, Turkey, Iran, Israel, the Republic of China, the Philippines, and Korea. That list appears to me to be incomplete. There should be other countries that ought to be considered there for possible inclusion. What about Thailand? Certainly Thailand is subject to external dangers. What about India? India had to resist invasion.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is asking me to yield so he can accept my amendment, I will yield. Otherwise, I would like to finish my statement.

We must consider India as being subject to possible Communist aggression. And Ethiopia is threatened by Somalia, which is being armed by Communist countries. Ethiopia is in deep trouble. Morocco is being threatened by Algeria. These are some of the countries which would have to be included if we are going to have a list.

But I do not think we should have a list of this kind. For one thing, we cannot tell in advance whether there will be changes in the international situation that will require some sophisticated weapons to be used by other countries.

The section as it is drawn I believe to be wholly unworkable for this reason: There is no such thing as a given figure for any particular country's AID program, from which the amount of arms purchases could be withheld or deducted. It is like saying "2 cents off." Two cents off what?

The AID agency does not start off—and I have been in this aid business, and I know something about it—by saying to Ethiopia, "We have \$10 million for you this year. Now let us figure out how we are going to spend it." That is not how it is done. We talk about projects, and we sign project agreements, and when those project agreements are signed, as we come to the end of the year, then we may have a total of what the AID program for that country will be for that year.

What the Conte amendment would require us to do is, if some arms purchase is made that we dislike, that we would then have to go back and say, "No, we will have to back away from this or that project contract. We cannot go through with it."

Finally, I think, Mr. Chairman, this is a punitive provision as it is now drawn. I think it would poison relations with a



lot of countries. There are many countries, for example, in Africa where we have small technical assistance programs going on just to show we are interested in their welfare and their development. They amount to a few thousand dollars. To say to them that if they purchase one jet plane, we are going to cancel out that program, just would not make sense. That would not stimulate the growth of the country we are interested in.

I agree that many countries waste funds on sophisticated equipment they do not need, but there are other ways they waste funds. They waste funds on corruption. Are we going to say that we will hold out so much aid if someone is found guilty of corruption? They also waste it by not having effective tax programs. Are we going to say we will withhold so much aid if they do not do so and so in terms of their tax legislation and enforcement?

I think the effect of the language as it is now drawn will not be to stop the use of military equipment but simply will be to interfere with and poison and destroy the usefulness of the technical and economic assistance programs which are covered in this bill.

My amendment would simply say that, where missile systems and jet aircraft are not needed for external defense, the President would be directed to withhold economic assistance to the extent that he finds the purpose of the economic assistance is being frustrated by the purchase of these unnecessary weapons systems.

That will do the job. It will give the President leverage with which to seek the elimination of these sophisticated weapons systems where they are not needed. It will also do the job of taking care of countries like Ethiopia and India, which do need sophisticated weapons, where they are threatened by Communist aggression.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I do not know of any language in the bill which had any more thorough discussion than section 119.

As brought out by one distinguished member of the subcommittee, we have given the Latin American countries an average of \$1.1 billion of economic aid annually during the past 5 years, and the same Latin American countries actually have been spending \$1.5 billion annually for the same period for military assistance. If they had not been determined to build up military machines, they could have financed all of their own economic assistance programs and had \$400 million left over to spend for some other purpose.

It is perfectly obvious to me that if we credit Latin American countries and other underdeveloped countries with billions of dollars, with which they can satisfy the needs of their economies, that releases to those nations the dollars or foreign exchange they earn from their exports to buy military equipment. We are defeating the purpose of our economic aid to them when we permit these countries to spend their own resources on military equipment.

I hope that the amendment will be

voted down, so that we may continue to help the Latin American countries with economic assistance to help them increase the standard of living of their people. I do not want them to liquidate their own resources on military equipment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I might say I had planned to offer an amendment to strike section 119 of this bill. However, in view of my lack of success with previous amendments, and for other reasons, I have decided against it.

I cannot resist imposing on the Committee's time—and I realize it is late—to point out that this subject also was under the serious, direct, and very considered judgment by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. If the Committee on Appropriations had views, individually or collectively, it might have been well to have had their views at the time the authorization bill itself was put together.

Let me read section 620(s) dealing with this general subject. I should like at least to raise the question whether this language does not cover in a better way the problem represented by these underdeveloped countries than the language in the committee bill.

Section 620(s) reads as follows:

In furnishing development assistance under this Act, and in making sales under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, the President shall take into account (1) the percentage of the recipient or purchasing country's budget which is devoted to military purposes—

I should like to say that this seems a better test of whether or not assistance should be provided, than simply to confine ourselves to the problem presented by so-called sophisticated weapons. This means a determination must be made as to the entire amount being spent for any weapons. I continue—

and (2) the degree to which the recipient or purchasing country is using its foreign exchange resources to acquire military equipment.

Again, this is broader language than the committee proposal.

Section 620(s) continues:

When the President finds that development assistance under this Act, or sales under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, are being diverted to military expenditures, or a recipient or purchasing country is diverting its own resources to unnecessary military expenditures, to a degree which materially interferes with its development, the President shall terminate such assistance and sales until he is assured that such diversion will no longer take place. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.

I would suggest that this is strong language. It would surely create a very direct responsibility on the administrator of these programs, and indeed on the President himself, to think carefully before he provides assistance to a country which he thinks is incapable of supporting a program or is straining its resources which should be used for development. We do not need language both in an ap-

propriation bill and in the authorization bill to express our concern about this problem. I hope that we could do without the language in section 119 altogether.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I support the gentleman from New York, though I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey that it would be better to have nothing. It seems to me the language composed by the gentleman from New York accomplishes the very worthwhile objective that the committee seeks to serve, which is to discourage underdeveloped countries from wasting their money which is provided by various AID programs on arms, but avoids mischief which could inadvertently take place under the language of the Committee on Appropriations. I hope that the Committee will support the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I agree with the gentleman, if we must have legislation written in an appropriation bill, the language of the gentleman from New York is far preferable to that in the committee bill.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, that was a real fallacious argument the gentleman from New York just made. Why, this amendment to my amendment does nothing, because, will not the gentleman agree with me, that the President of the United States has that power at the present time to withhold any funds from any country? Answer that question.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Since I have the time, I would like to use it, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit.

Mr. CONTE. Why do you not answer that question?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I just have taken the trouble to read the language giving the President authority.

Mr. CONTE. I have read it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say to the gentleman that I have not yielded to him. I might if he gives me half a chance to finish my sentence.

I emphasize that the President has very strict instructions in the language of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and if the gentleman from New Jersey will take the well, I will be glad to carry on the colloquy with him.

I want to say to the House, as the gentleman well knows, I have tremendous admiration for the gentleman from New Jersey and for the work that he has done for many years in his Committee on Foreign Affairs. However, I take strong issue with the gentleman when he persists in the implication that we on the Committee on Appropriations are not really fully competent on these delicate problems. I realize that the gentleman does not quite want to go that far, but the fact of the matter is I have been

sitting on this committee for some time now, and before I came on it I was on the Committee on Armed Services. So I am not entirely ignorant about military matters or military assistance programs. It further so happens that I tend to agree with the gentleman more than I disagree with him, but I find it a little irritating when he persists in suggesting that the members of this committee, who examined the matter in great detail, are not quite aware of what we are talking about. I am sorry that all of our colleagues have not read these justification books which I hold in my hand. I refer especially to classified material. I would like to recite them, if I could. I regret that we seem always to be inhibited in our conversations because of the obvious sensitivity with respect to classified data and specific countries. But even the unclassified data reveals detailed economic and social facts; for example, the gross national products, per capita incomes, literacy rates, life expectancies, growth rates, income distributions, and defense data.

And, the more we read about it, and the more we understand the past mistakes that have been made, it seems to me that we as legislators are hoping to see that we do not repeat it. That is all which is involved here.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COHELAN. I want to be sure that I give my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] an opportunity to respond. I did not intend to make a speech here.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am not sure just what I have said over the past 2 days that leads the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] to think that I do not respect, appreciate, and understand the knowledge, the foresight, and the perception of the Committee on Appropriations.

My sole point has been that it is an inappropriate place, meaning appropriations—in fact, it is forbidden by the rules of the House to have the Committee on Appropriations take a policy position. I am saying, however, that the appropriate place for that determination to be made is in an authorization bill.

We fully understand the perception, the understanding and the initiative as well as the energy of the members of the Committee on Appropriations. However, it is better directed in an authorization bill than to be wasted upon or to be put into the wrong kind of bill, in an appropriation bill.

I am not arguing about the mistakes of the past, I am simply pointing out the fact that authorization bill, or the basic legislation for previous years, already covers almost every point which is in contention here. One or two of those points are covered in a different way which might deserve at least additional consideration. There might be improvements made, had the Committee on Appropriations used the authorization route, instead of taking it unto themselves to write this legislation.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I think that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] fails to realize the fact that we adopted the rule providing for the consideration of this legislation upon yesterday.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts that I am well aware of that fact, although I was hoping that it would not be adopted because of the present situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is well aware of the fact that the rule providing for the consideration of this bill was adopted by a vote of 200 to 190, a rule providing for the consideration of this bill and, in effect, saying that we can do this.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to comment further with respect to this matter. Actually, when one goes through and reviews the materials, year after year, and when one goes back and examines the mistakes that have been made in the nonclassified book, in the green book, one finds a cumulative total of military assistance that has gone to some countries where that result has been absolutely disastrous. We have seen this happen enough to want to halt such waste and bad policy.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the members of the Committee how impressed I was while doing my field work, which our friends in the press so often criticize when I had a Minister of Defense of an African country tell me, in effect, "Please do not be so good to us; you are killing us." He said, "We do not need all this; all we want is a little Swiss defense program."

However, Mr. Chairman, some of the more advanced military assistance people from our country come in and advise. In some cases there are such things involved as sales, and there are other prosaic incentives for encouraging military assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a statement from the author of section 119 as it now appears as to why, for example, Greece which is currently under a military dictatorship, is an exception to this provision and is permitted to buy sophisticated military equipment without difficulty; whereas, a country such as Ethiopia which is threatened from aggression by Somalia is not?

Why are the Philippines excluded, while Thailand is not excluded?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I

yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York asked why we exclude sophisticated weapons going to some countries and not to others. What we wanted to do was to make sure that sophisticated weapons did not go to countries that do not need them or had no justified requirement. These sophisticated weapons are to go to countries that are on the frontier of Communist aggression and not those countries which are not on the frontier of Communist aggression.

Greece is close to that frontier, furthermore Greece is in NATO, and so we felt that Greece should be made a recognized exception.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the gentleman from Maryland feel that India, which has suffered an invasion by Communist China, is not entitled to sophisticated weapons?

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would reply to that and say that there are classified matters involved in this discussion. I can only say to the gentleman that we offered India certain military aircraft. I would further say to the gentleman that they would not take it because they wanted hotter and more sophisticated equipment. I would further like to say to the gentleman that they obtained this equipment from Russia. Since they decided to accept military assistance from us we have contributed to the defense of their country in very substantial dollar terms.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. May I say to the gentleman—

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further to the gentleman from Maryland.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, my question is whether it is the committee's feeling that a country that has been subjected to an invasion by Communist China is not reasonably entitled to have sophisticated equipment for its defense?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to answer that question.

Mr. OTTINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I believe we gave India her chance. We gave India a great many weapons, and I believe most of us realize that they used them, not against the Communist aggressors, but against a friendly country—or a country, at least, which is to us—and one that we were hoping to help.

I might say to the gentleman that my first concern with this whole business was when I was in the Amritsar-Lahore sector of the 15th Indian Division Headquarters, and I saw a whole park full of tanks which we had given to Pakistan destroyed by tanks and antitank weapons we had given to India. At that time it dawned on me that our foreign aid



program had achieved the ultimate in perversion.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am as disturbed as the gentleman from Maryland is about the India-Pakistan question. But I would say to the gentleman that he should remember that India was attacked by Communist China, and we did provide help, and there is help that is needed on that frontier today.

We cannot get away from rivalries between some of the nations. Does the gentleman suppose that by the passage of this legislation we can solve the problems that exist between Pakistan and India?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to answer one part of this question—the Indian answer was sufficient as far as I am concerned, but the gentleman mentioned Thailand twice, and that was when I asked the gentleman to yield.

The reason Thailand is not in here, and Laos is not in here, is because they are in the Defense bill, they are not part of this bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is pertinent to my question about Thailand, but not to my question about Ethiopia.

Mr. CONTE. I can give the gentleman the answer about Ethiopia. I feel that there should be no more arms for Ethiopia. Ethiopia is the oldest Christian nation in the world, and it has the highest illiteracy in the world in that nation. I have been in Ethiopia twice. I have traveled that country from top to bottom. They have more misery and sickness in Ethiopia than any country in the world, and they are spending all of their money on military equipment, and not by my vote are they going to get any more.

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman misses the point that I have tried to make.

Mr. CONTE. Let the United Nations go in there and take care of the situation. I am not going to be a peddler of war armaments.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say on this question of whether Ethiopia, India, or any other country should be added to the exceptions, that we should let the Congress decide that. Whenever it becomes apparent in the future that a given country like Ethiopia, or whoever it might be, needs sophisticated weapons, and that we want to subsidize them by further economic aid, then I am prepared to vote for that if it is in the national interest. But I do not believe Congress should abdicate its authority. I hope the House will support the Committee on Appropriations, and vote down the Bingham amendment.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment in regard to the types of weapons that have been given to the Near East and Southeast Asian countries in past years.

First of all, let me say that most of the military sales in the years from 1962 to 1966 went to the developed areas. The percentage, I believe, was nearly 90 percent.

In regard to the military assistance that went to the less developed countries, may I say that a good part of it went to the South Asia-Far East region. It went to countries on the borders of the Communist empire.

I would also like to comment on this question of Greece where at the present time there is a great deal of difficulty over Cyprus between Greece and Turkey.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the President of the United States has withheld major weapons, of the type here discussed, from those countries for the reason that we do not want them to get into an arms race and into a conflict. We have withheld that type of aid from Greece recently and I am sure that the President will do it again if in the future similar circumstances should arise in other areas that could lead to open conflicts.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. I would just like to say, I do not think this is a very good provision. But I want to say that the reason this is in the bill is because the U.S. Government has not done a very good job with respect to the allocation, or the sale of arms around the world.

To that extent, I am sympathetic with what the authors of this amendment are trying to do.

We sold some attack A4-B's to Argentina.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One-hundred and eight Members are present, a quorum.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield further to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I think our Government has made some serious errors as to where these weapons are to be sold and transferred to nations around the world. I, therefore, respect the motive that lies behind the amendment that has been offered by the subcommittee. But I am unhappy about the fact of the sale of sophisticated aircraft to Argentina which apparently set off an arms race in Latin America.

I am unhappy about the fact that we have continued to give military aid to the country of Greece which is under a regressive military dictatorship.

The only reason I am not going to stay with the subcommittee on this is that I think in actual practice this amendment will work a hardship on some democratic nations and would allow those countries that are relatively better off to conduct an arms race of their own and put at a serious disadvantage other countries which may be threatened by such an arms race.

In voting for the Bingham amendment, I want the members of the subcommittee to understand that I fully ap-

preciate their concern. I think the Pentagon ought to take notice of the deep concern that exists in this House of Representatives about the practices that they have followed.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a clipping which illustrates the problems we open for ourselves when our Government consents to sell jets and other sophisticated weapons to very poor countries. Here is a clipping from the Evening Star of November 15 of this year. It is datelined Copenhagen, Denmark:

Sweden's plane makers see the possibility of lucrative new markets in light of Washington's decision to permit the sale of advanced U.S. fighter aircraft to Latin American nations.

The Swedish Saab concern hopes to push its 105XT training, reconnaissance and low-level attack fighter, which has General Electric engines in the export version, in Latin America.

And if Saab can get a foot in the market with the 105XT, it has ready the mach 2 all-weather Draken lined up as the next step up the ladder. For any country which has the means for a really sophisticated air force the Viggen will be coming onto the market in the mid 1970s.

We are providing the means. The purpose of the passage in the appropriation bill to which this amendment objects was to prevent the waste and diversion of economic aid from the true purpose for which it was planned, namely, to help poor countries to achieve a better standard of living for their people to increase the sum of human happiness, and to prevent those people from going Communist and thereby presenting a world threat to the United States.

This provision would not have been necessary if the administration—and I am glad to hear the gentleman from Minnesota say what he did—had not shown repeatedly that it cannot be relied upon to prevent such waste and such diversions. We have had the administration come before us both in committees and in informal meetings—for example, in Congressman Reuss' office—and to state in the blandest and most disingenuous way that sales of 1,000-mile-an-hour planes would serve a useful purpose, one that would not really divert resources from schools, roads, and agricultural improvement.

Second, even if it would, the military of this country insist on it, and we were trying to get along with the military in these countries.

Third, that when all else failed, those planes were really useful for antiguerrilla purposes, in spite of the fact that only one of the countries proposing to buy these planes even claims any guerrillas, and the fact that a plane like this, traveling at the rate of 2,000 miles an hour, will not stay in the air long enough to fight guerrillas. Two hours at the most is the longest we can get them to stay in the air over Vietnam, and we have not had the slightest use of the high-speed jetplane in fighting guerrillas.

All that the amendment of the gentle-

man from New York proposes to do is to open the back door after we in the committee have closed the front door. What he wants to do is to leave it up to the President and the administration, when repeatedly the President and the administration have shown that they put such a construction on their powers that they are going to go ahead and sell these jets. They have made that clear. They have said so again and again. And I do not see why we do not believe what they say. We want to stop them from selling these jets and sophisticated weapons systems.

The question has been asked as to why this should be done in an appropriation bill. It is being done in the appropriation bill because the authorizing committee did not do its job. It is the job of the Appropriations Committee to make sure that the money of this country is spent wisely and is not wasted. We have written into the bill purely negative limitations. There is no constructive legislation in the bill. That is the job of the authorizing committee, and we are not writing such new legislation into this bill. We are merely saying what cannot be done.

From time immemorial this has been the function of the Appropriations Committee, and I defy anyone on the Foreign Affairs Committee to say anything to the contrary.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee will vote down this amendment because it would open up the back door and leave it open, when I think our job is to close all doors and keep them closed.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to refer to two points: First, in reference to some of the ironies of military assistance—and this has already been referred to—the only reason I comment is because my good and dear friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] has raised the subject. In fact, it was because we gave such substantial weapons systems to one of these countries that we got into trouble with the other country.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I hope everyone will vote against the amendment and thereby support section 119 as in the bill.

Let me state further, Mr. Chairman, the provision that was supported and passed by the conference committee, in regard to this particular aspect, says that when the President finds that development assistance or sales under the Agricultural Trade Act are being diverted to military expenditures, or a recipient or purchasing country is diverting its own resources to unnecessary military expenditures to a degree which materially interferes with development, the President shall terminate such assistance and sales until he is assured that such diversion will no longer take place.

Why are we giving economic assistance to every country in Latin America and to many of the countries in Africa?

Because they do not have the economic resources to do the job themselves. We consider all of the countries in Latin America at this time to be developing countries.

Then why did we sell 50 airplanes to Argentina, as the gentleman from Minnesota has mentioned, and trigger off the arms race in Latin America, which caused Chile to go in and buy the British Hawks, and which caused Peru to come in to buy Mirages and F-5's. We were the ones who triggered off that arms race.

Our provision concerning the sale of sophisticated weapons is an attempt to stop just this kind of dangerous situation from happening. It is a fair provision. Let me explain again what it does. It says only that if any country in Latin America or in Africa goes out to buy this sophisticated military equipment, these weapons of war, then their economic assistance will be cut accordingly.

So, for example, under this provision, assuming the proposed purchase of planes by Peru from France costs \$24 million, we would then cut economic assistance to Peru down by \$24 million. This would discourage these countries from going out and getting into this crazy arms race, which they have gotten into. It would also say to them, if they do not want to make appropriate self-help efforts on their own behalf to improve their economic situation, we will reduce our assistance to them.

Let me read a statement from the Foreign Minister of Chile, Gabriel Valdez:

Each year \$1.4 billion is being spent for military assistance in Latin America.

He further stated that these costs, and I will quote:

Take the clothes off the backs, and food from the stomachs, and education from the minds, of children.

I could not agree with him more. For 9 years I have stood in this well and I have pleaded for foreign aid. I have taken the tough side on this issue because foreign aid certainly has little appeal with the people back home, but I cannot go on. I cannot continue supporting aid to countries who need money so desperately for food and for clothing and for medicine and for education, and who take this desperately needed money and divert it to buy weapons of war.

I hope this amendment, which gives this discretion to the President, is defeated, because we know what will happen. I hope section 119 is passed as is.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has just made a very eloquent speech, as is his wont, but if we consider this dispassionately and carefully and quietly, we will see that my amendment does exactly what the gentleman wants to do without damaging the technical assistance programs and the economic assistance programs which the gentleman so much believes in.

The gentleman speaks—and most of

the references this afternoon have been also—to Latin America, and this is where some of the outrages have occurred. There are no external threats of aggression to amount to anything in Latin America. I would agree to that. But this section is not limited to Latin America.

I would not agree—and I was shocked to hear the gentleman say—that a country like Ethiopia is not threatened—a country which once tried to defend itself against aggression, and which now is threatened by Somalia.

I should like to say further, the gentleman says that Thailand is not on this list, because military assistance to Thailand is not covered in this bill.

That is not the point. The point is that this section directs that economic assistance to Thailand be withheld if Thailand purchases from any source sophisticated weapons. I defy the gentleman to read it any other way.

The whole point here is that it is a great danger to try to list specific states and to say, "Now, for the next year, these are the only states we in the Congress say can buy sophisticated weapons. If other states do it, we will penalize them. We will hurt them."

There is another point. We will have to be snooping around, for all of these countries, to see whether they do buy sophisticated weapons. We will have to be snooping around in various African countries. Nigeria has been in trouble lately. I do not know whether Nigeria is using sophisticated weapons in the rebellion or not. We would have to go snooping to see. If we found that they were we would have to say that the technical assistance we give Nigeria, which is not large, would be reduced or cut out.

There are many countries to which we give small amounts of technical assistance, only a few thousand dollars, just to show that we are interested and to maintain a presence. If those countries decide they want to buy one jet aircraft—this is not limited to supersonic jets, but covers any kind of jet—if they want to buy some jet which they believe they need, we will have to cut out that technical assistance program, because the jet would cost a lot more than the small amount we might be spending on technical assistance for them.

I believe in this economic and technical aid program. I hate to see underdeveloped countries misuse their resources for military assistance. But please do not use this kind of meat-ax approach, that would allow no flexibility, that would be regarded as punitive by these various countries, as interfering with their sovereignty.

Let us do this in such a way as to give the President leverage to use. He has not had such leverage before. The authorizing legislation gives him some leverage, and my amendment would give him more. Let us direct the President to go to these countries and say, "Congress has directed me that we will have to cut your assistance if you use sophisticated weapons you do not need for external defense purposes."

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. We are not selling any military aircraft to Thailand. What aircraft Thailand has is the result of past military assistance programs for Thailand.

This is good legislation. We certainly hope the Members will support the committee.

I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. I am very much in sympathy with my friend from Massachusetts. I wish he had drawn an amendment so that I could support it. I believe there are a great many countries involved here. An amendment, soundly drawn, would give additional leeway. Many countries are threatened by communism, such as Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand, and they may well want to purchase some weapons some day. Automatically our aid program would be cut off.

I could even favor an absolute restriction. I agree that there should be an absolute restriction. But the amendment is not properly drafted. Any such absolute restriction should provide for exceptions for any country that might in the future become the victim of a Communist attack or "war of liberation." There should be greater flexibility in the exceptions to meet various unforeseen and unforeseeable changes of circumstance.

For the time being, the too flexible language of the gentleman from New York is far preferable to the too restrictive language of the bill.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I want to make it clear that Laos and Thailand are both in the defense bill. As the gentleman pointed out, they are not buying airplanes. We give them airplanes. They are all part of the Vietnam complex of South Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. They have all been taken out of here and put in the defense appropriation.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that is not correct. It does cover them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I shall be very brief. I just want to address my remarks to my very dear friend, the gentleman from New York, because it is rare when we disagree with one another on a foreign policy matter.

In terms of U.S. flexibility, I, too, am in favor of that.

I want to remind the gentleman and other like-thinking Members of this body that the foreign aid authorization bill passed by only eight votes. I suggest to them that if this clause is not in the

bill they will have a very difficult time in passing this legislation.

I believe what the American people are saying through us that abuse of this military assistance has got to stop.

The gentleman mentioned a couple of countries. I am reluctant to refer to specific countries. But he mentioned one country in particular and said it was threatened by another country. I happen to know something about that particular country. It is spending about 3 percent of its budget, which it cannot afford, on defense matters now. It is buying all the wrong things.

We are aiding and abetting it to the tune of over \$100 million in the last 10 years for strategic reasons which we think are important to our national interest. But I want to say, without making any reference to that country by name, that it has a per capita gross national product of \$58 and a population of 20-million-odd people, and I do not think they ought to have jet aircraft to fight guerrillas. The people in my district do not want them to buy that kind of fancy hardware when they desperately need help to meet their national needs.

As far as economic assistance is concerned, I will go all the way with the World Bank, all the way with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and all the way with the African Development Bank and AID development loan and technical assistance. I have seen many of these projects, and they were excellent projects. But I do not want to see this military hardware infection spread into these societies by my country.

And mark this: We are not through with revolution in Africa. I predict that if we persist in arming these areas, they will turn on one another.

Incidentally, this is not limited to the countries named in this bill. I think in the long term we need to examine what is going on in some of the other countries, as has been referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM]. I agree with him about Greece. Greece has to be examined very carefully.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I wonder if we can reach an agreement on the amount of time we need to finish this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in listening to this last phase of debate on this bill, I wonder if Congress ought to beef up the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the super-duper agency that some of you created a few years ago, with another \$10 or \$20 million a year to prove even more effectively how ineffective it really is.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Briefly.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the happiest moments in my 9 years in the House of Representatives, because it is the first time I have agreed with the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That we ought to dispense with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency?

Mr. COHELAN. That we ought to beef them up.

Mr. GROSS. Get rid of it, lock, stock and barrel.

Of course, this debate only proves more clearly than ever that this place, instead of being called the model city of the United States, should be called malfunction junction.

But I really arose to ask some of you whose hearts have been bleeding about the underdeveloped, and who know what part this bill plays in their lives, to tell me something about Nigeria. I understand that there have been around \$200 million expended in Nigeria to make a showcase of that country. I have been unable to find out how much there is in the budget for this country that is now going through a civil war having washed out \$200 million of our taxpayers' money.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if somebody could tell me what is in the budget for Nigeria as contained in this bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I shall undertake to answer the question of the gentleman. That is all classified material. If the gentleman from Iowa will come up here, I shall be happy to show it to him.

Mr. GROSS. How nice.

Mr. CONTE. I think the gentleman from Iowa knows the circumstances surrounding these figures.

Mr. GROSS. No, I do not or I would not have asked the question. It is nice to keep all of this information under wraps, so that we can go on spending more money there. I assume that some of the money is being expended over there to provide weapons and materiel to certain segments of that country's population to decimate the population by the thousands, weapons which have been supplied by us as well as by the Russians.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman from Iowa is not telling me that you do not receive that information before the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. GROSS. Let me tell the gentleman that you do not have time to get much of any information in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, in clarification, I think we should state for the record that both economic grant aid and military aid to these countries is justified to the Congress on an "illustrative" basis. None of the funds recommended in this bill is earmarked for any country. The Executive may or may not provide economic or military assistance to these nations, unless it is specifically precluded in the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have always referred to the fact that we are dealing with an "illustrative program" and it is so be-

cause the executive may spend the money in any way they wish.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure that the gentleman from Louisiana will agree with me that for all the taxpayers' money that has been ladled out in Nigeria, money for this so-called showcase government, we have not received very much in return.

Mr. PASSMAN. I might say that the glass is rather muddled and the showcase does not look too good.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Louisiana will stay on his feet, what about the case of Liberia?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if I have the figures—

Mr. GROSS. As I have the figures, we have spewed out about \$210 million to that country; is that not correct?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Has that effort and that expenditure of that amount of money brought up their literacy rate, or are they still about 90 or 95 percent illiterate, and still a country with the highest infant mortality rate of all the African countries?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, those statistics are not too readily available.

Mr. GROSS. And, let me ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] how much was expended upon that Presidential Palace in Liberia?

Mr. CONTE. About \$12 million. As the gentleman from Iowa will recall, I had a few words to say about that.

Mr. GROSS. Well, thank you and good night. I will be unable to stand much more discussion of this \$2.7 billion bill without becoming nauseated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM].

The amendment was rejected.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHELAN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COHELAN: On page 14, immediately after line 16, insert the following:

"Sec. 120. None of the funds appropriated or made available by this Act for carrying out titles I, II, and VI of chapter 2, and chapter 4, of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used for financing, in whole or in part, any capital assistance project as estimated to cost in excess of \$1,000,000, until the head of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of such Act has received and taken into consideration a report on the review of the proposed capital assistance project, conducted by the Controller of such agency with such assistance from other divisions of such agency as he may request, which report shall set forth the Controller's views, comments, and such recommendations as he may deem appropriate with respect to the adequacy of the justification, feasibility studies, and prospects for effective utilization of such project."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] reserves a point of order against the amendment

which has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment. It was included in the foreign aid authorization bill which we passed this session, but it was somehow lost in conference.

The investigation which prompted this amendment was performed by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], his distinguished colleagues on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, and the able staff of that committee.

This amendment is designed to correct an obvious deficiency in the capital assistance program of the Agency for International Development.

The record of the Agency for International Development is, I regret to say, less than good. There have been too many poorly planned and managed capital assistance projects. This is evidenced by the number of congressional reports, GAO reports, and even the Agency's own audit report issued year after year. Those reports disclose numerous instances of poorly planned and managed projects.

In spite of section 611 of the Foreign Assistance Act which was enacted to prevent such happenings, millions of dollars have gone to finance less than satisfactory projects. Obviously, an additional control—independent of the existing procedures for capital assistance—must be built into the processing mechanism.

This amendment would do just that. It provides that when more than \$1 million is provided for any capital assistance project, the Agency must consider the findings of the Agency's Controller as to the project's justification, feasibility, and prospects for effective utilization. Placing this additional review responsibility in the Office of the Controller allows for an independent preaudit outside the planning machinery which already exists. This should help greatly to insure the success of the project.

The additional workload required by this amendment would be very little. However, the benefits derived in terms of well-founded projects effectively utilized and maintained could be phenomenal. For example, if we take the Agency's capital assistance lending for the past fiscal year and apply the \$1 million criteria, this amendment would affect 50 loans out of a total of 64. But they would represent 98 percent of the total dollar value of loans signed during that year. As of the end of the 1967 fiscal year, there were 60 loans of this type authorized but not signed. If all these were to become loans in the current fiscal year, this amendment would affect only 47 out of the 60 loans. But—significantly—they would represent 98 percent of the total dollar value.

This amendment would help to prevent the building of power plants that sink into swamps, such as the thermal power plant in Santa Cruz, Brazil; schools without teachers, such as the school construction program in northeast Brazil; and roads that go nowhere, such as the road in southern Peru that ended at a mountainside. Unfortunately, AID has supported such projects in the past. We should make sure this never happens

again. Too much of this program has been audited after the fact. What it needs is some preaudit.

Mr. Chairman, in short, this amendment would provide the additional control needed to make sure that AID assisted projects are justified, feasible, and will be effectively utilized and maintained. This can be accomplished with little additional workload by a performance audit, before millions of dollars of U.S. assistance are committed to such projects.

Mr. Chairman, we need this additional control and I strongly urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to say that I agree wholeheartedly with the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. I would add that I offered this motion in the committee during the consideration of the authorizing legislation, and it was accepted unanimously, but as the gentleman knows it was lost in the conference.

I believe this would be helpful in the administration of this legislation.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman. I am very happy to present this amendment to the House at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I must insist upon my point of order to the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York wish to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes. The point of order is based on the fact that this puts language in the bill, by this amendment, which would cause additional duties to be performed, and it is therefore legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order raised by the gentleman from New York?

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I was not aware that this procedural point would be raised. It would seem to me that, on the basis of the arguments that have been going on almost the entire afternoon, and on the basis of the references made by my distinguished colleague from Maryland in reference to the functions of the Committee on Appropriations, that I will choose to regard my proposal as a limiting amendment, and therefore germane to the argument before us today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California adds a new section to the bill which would impose additional duties, determinations, and obligations upon the head of an agency that are not now required under existing law. Therefore the Chair holds that the amendment proposes additional legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.



Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to make several inquiries of members of the Committee on Appropriations. But before I do so, I want to apologize if I have offended any member of the great Committee on Appropriations by questioning their knowledge of what is contained in their bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. I just want to say to the gentleman, he does not have to apologize to any member of the Committee on Appropriations on his birthday. I wish him many more happy birthdays.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, we have just concluded reading title I. I have a question or two to ask of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] regarding section 118.

I have a strong suspicion of the provisions of section 118. I seem to recall that a similar provision originated in the other body some time ago and was put into an earlier appropriation bill by the other body.

Mr. PASSMAN. The distinguished gentleman is correct. This language—section 118—was placed in the bill by a Member of the other body last year and we just carried it forward in the bill this year. I do not recall any opposition to the amendment last year when we brought back the conference report.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I do thank the chairman.

I thought I recognized this as the so-called Birch Bayh amendment which deals with the purchases of certain steel products for our military in Vietnam.

The country particularly involved in these provisions is Korea. Korea can and is supplying galvanized sheets for Vietnam under tightened regulations drawn by AID. But I submit that one important factor that the proponents of this amendment have not considered is that Korea is also supplying combat forces in Vietnam. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, it is shortsighted on our part to impose a penalty on Korea by making it difficult for that country to continue her economic development through provisions such as the one contained in section 118 of the bill.

I may add, Mr. Chairman, that I thought of offering an amendment to strike out section 118 of the bill. I feel that such action was warranted because the subject of the Bayh amendment has been examined and reexamined by the House and the other body on a number of occasions. Last year, our chairman set aside an entire session of our hearings in order to hear the distinguished Senator from Indiana. We also took testimony from the executive branch. After careful and repeated study, our committee, the House and the other body would not support the Bayh amendment. But somehow it became part of law—not in a legislative bill but once again in an appropriations bill.

This is not good legislation. It imposes

an unnecessary restriction which is not in our national interest. It penalizes an ally who is fighting at our side in Vietnam.

I feel strongly that this section should be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE  
(OTHER)

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT  
PEACE CORPS

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, including purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for use outside the United States, \$105,000,000, of which not to exceed \$28,400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, on numerous occasions I have taken the floor of the House to praise the work being done by the Peace Corps and to bring to the attention of our colleagues some particularly noteworthy accomplishments of the Corps. Today, the future of the Corps growth and development is at stake and I rise to urge the House to restore the \$12.7 million cut from its appropriation by the Appropriations Committee.

From the very first day of the Corps, economy has been a key word. Every effort has been made to cut costs wherever and whenever possible and I believe the figures speak for themselves—in fiscal year 1962 there were 919 volunteers at an annual average cost of approximately \$9,000 per volunteer. In fiscal year 1967 there were some 11,600 volunteers at an annual average cost of \$7,453 per volunteer. In just 1 year, costs were cut by \$414 per volunteer.

At every level—from senior officials of the Washington staff to the volunteers in the field, from the Washington operations to those overseas—nonessential spending has either been drastically reduced or completely eliminated. There never have been any frills in the Peace Corps and this agency serves as proof that the “fat” can be cut from the Federal budget.

However, with an appropriation of only \$105 million, the Corps will become smaller. Instead of the planned strength increase to over 12,000 volunteers, it will drop to approximately 10,600—a reduction of about 1,000 volunteers.

The Peace Corps has proved the validity of working from the bottom up rather than from the top down in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Near East. It has demonstrated the success potential of community-development techniques of having our people live with the people they are assisting in the slums that surround all of the major cities of these

countries and in the countryside in the rural peasant villages. It has demonstrated the importance and practicality of stimulated self-help—and the economy of such programs. It has shown that work in primitive societies does not necessarily require highly skilled, highly paid technicians—that the average citizen of this country can play a meaningful role in the development of a country where infant mortality is over 50 percent and the people do not know the significance of feces disposal, water impurities or a sound diet. It has proven the feasibility and efficacy of intensive language and cultural preparation of our foreign cadres, of having them live within the communities they serve rather than in isolated American ghettos; of having them receive compensation comparable to their host counterparts and play roles not as superior advisers but as coequals.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on at great length about the many and meaningful successes and accomplishments of the Peace Corps, of its universal acceptance throughout the world at every strata of society, and of its bold new approach—and I must say a refreshing one—to our overseas relations. However, I feel very strongly that the most urgent issue now before us is to take prompt action to restore these urgently needed funds to the Corps appropriation so that it can follow through on already planned programs, increase its strength and effectiveness, and fully honor the commitments made to some 58 foreign governments.

While I have consistently urged that economies be practiced in all Federal agencies and programs, and that Federal spending can and should be curtailed and reduced, I am convinced the Corps has done everything it could in this regard and is now operating at top efficiency. I have received Jack Vaughn's assurances that he and his staff will continue to probe for economies.

Mr. Chairman, from the conversation with my colleagues in both Houses, from the public pronouncements of praise for the Peace Corps so many have made on the floor of Congress and elsewhere, I know that the large majority of Members share my views. I hope the conferees on this measure will substantially restore this unfortunate cut.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Chairman, I did not vote for the foreign aid authorization bill, nor the conference report, and I am opposed to the foreign aid appropriation bill, H.R. 13893.

It is time for the American people and the American Congress to face this issue bluntly.

Since the beginning of our foreign aid program, following the end of World War II, our people have furnished foreign governments more than \$130 billion. Some \$48 billion of this has gone for armaments. Many of these alleged



allies vote against us in the United Nations, work against us, mock us, insult us, and many of them now supply our enemies in Vietnam.

Foreign aid has been marked by innumerable examples of mismanagement. We have financed yachts for tyrants, palaces for petty potentates, airlines for countries whose citizens have no place to fly. Our weapons go around the world, fostering civil wars and underpinning the power of totalitarian regimes. They have made possible wars between allies.

Foreign governments, in large measure because of our aid dollars, have purchased so much of our gold that U.S. gold reserves have dropped from \$24 billion in 1949 to \$13 billion now. In addition, there are in foreign hands \$29 billion in dollar claims payable in gold—more than twice the amount of gold we have with which to pay it.

Our national debt is now approximately \$340 billion and costs us more than \$15 billion a year in interest charges. Unless our fantastic level of Government spending is checked, the value of the dollar will sink out of sight.

We are well past the stage at which our resources were needed to reconstruct Europe and Japan from the destruction of World War II. They are no longer prostrate. They are healthy, growing, and prosperous. It is the United States which is bleeding now—and we are the bulwark of the free world. If we go down, the whole free world structure will come crashing with us. And our national debt is 50 percent greater than the total debt of all the other nations of the free world.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the first object of our foreign policy should be to preserve the strength of our country, not to hunt for new outlets through which to leak our lifeblood.

Yesterday, we voted to continue the war on poverty. I am glad to see us turning our attention and our resources to the relief of our own people. There is much wrong with the administration of the war on poverty, but there is an advantage to it which is lacking in the foreign aid program: the fact that the anti-poverty program is at home where we can keep an eye on it. Foreign aid is run through 74 capitals around the world, each with its own bureaucracy, each well beyond the probing eye of citizens or Congress.

We have passed the point of diminishing returns in this program, Mr. Chairman. We are faced with the need to reconcile our policies to our people. And I submit that there is not a country in the world which cannot and will not see the logic of our taking such a position. No one will blame us for taking steps to secure the strength of our country, especially when they know that their very survival rests on the bedrock of American strength and resolution.

With the same faith and courage with which we undertook the task of rebuilding the free world more than 20 years ago, let us now accept the fact that this job has been done, as far as we can do it without damage to ourselves. Let us not decide the issue on the basis of the continuing needs of other countries, but rather let us decide this issue on the

basis of our financial ability to continue this aid. Let us vote to end the program now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

None of the funds made available because of the provisions of this title shall be used by the Export-Import Bank to either guarantee the payment of any obligation hereafter incurred by any Communist country (as defined in section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended) or any agency or national thereof, in any other way to participate in the extension of credit to any such country, agency, or national, in connection with the purchase of any product by such country, agency, or national, except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate within 30 days after such determination.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROCK

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Brock: On page 20, line 7, strike line 7 and all that follows through line 10 and insert in lieu thereof: "the Congress determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest."

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It changes the exception clause with regard to Presidential determination to give that authority to the Congress instead of the President. The reason I offer the amendment is primarily in order to conform to an action which we have already taken in the Banking and Currency Committee. It adopted an amendment which I offered to the authorizing legislation of the Export-Import Bank, and which would make the determination available to the appropriate committees of the Congress, and they were to report to the Congress.

I am simply asking that we change the Appropriation Act to allow the Congress of the United States to make the determination, that if an exception is allowed to the furnishing of credits to a Communist nation, the determination be made by the Congress rather than by the administration.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Earlier I objected to giving the president the right to determine whether military assistance should go to Communist countries. I still feel that way. But under the Constitution our foreign policies are the prerogative of the President of the United States. One of his current policies is to build bridges to the East. While I may not agree with that policy I think this language—which requires a Presidential determination—is good language as it requires the President to take a second look before he uses the facilities of the Export-Import Bank to further his foreign policy.

The Export-Import Bank is operated to provide funds to promote the sale of American commodities only. The Bank is indeed well operated under the extremely able President, Harold F. Linder. Not only has the Bank made a tremendous profit for the American taxpayers, but it has also made it possible for American manufacturers and businessmen to

earn billions of dollars in profits on the sale of their commodities to countries overseas.

The language on page 20 of the bill requires that each and every determination by the President to extend assistance to Communist countries must be reported to the House of Representatives and to the Senate within 30 days after such determination.

Personally, I have no desire to see the legislative branch assume the prerogatives of the executive and administer our foreign policy. I am wondering how ridiculous we would look if we were to ask the President of the Export-Import Bank to report to the Congress on his negotiations for loans and then to let the Congress determine that each such loan or guarantee is in the national interest. It is rather obvious that if such a proposal should be enacted, under our legislative processes it may require many weeks or months before the determination would be approved or disapproved.

In addition thereto, it would be usurping the power of the executive, and in this instance I do not consider that to be in the best interest of our economy.

I trust this amendment will be voted down, and let us continue on the same basis that we have operated in the past several years—since 1963, to be exact.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

I think it is dangerous to tie the hands completely of the Chief Executive of our country.

This is not my feeling today. It is my feeling throughout the many years that I have been a Member of this body, without regard to the political affiliation of the President of the United States. During the 8 years of President Eisenhower's administration, I took the same position. I think it would be a dangerous thing to do, to establish a precedent that we might all regret. Without going unnecessarily into detail, because I think we are all acquainted with the basic questions and issues involved, I repeat that the language of the bill at least reserves in the President under certain limitations an exercise of his judgment, and one that should reside in any Chief Executive of our country.

I say this without regard to the political affiliations, because to me, as I have said, during the 8 years of President Eisenhower's administration, I never referred to him as a Republican, because he was my President—elected as a Republican, it is true, but he was the President of the United States.

The position I take today is one that I have consistently taken without regard to political tenor or political atmosphere of the administration in control. I urge the rejection of the amendment.

SUBSTITUTIVE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIPSCOMB

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the



amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LIPSCOMB as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BROCK: On page 20, line 6, place a period after the word "national", and strike the words "except when" and all of lines 7 through 10.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to strike out the part of title III which leaves the determination which the President has in the present language for giving credits to Communist countries or countries dealing with Communist countries. Under the present language, it says, "except when the President determines that such guarantees would be in the national interest and reports each such determination to the House of Representatives and the Senate within 30 days after such determination." The amendment I offer, strikes that language.

In this Congress we have had many days of debate over whether or not we should extend credit to a country which gives materiel and items to a Communist country which is supporting the Communist effort in North Vietnam.

At the present time there is under consideration with the Export-Import Bank, credit arrangements with the Fiat plant of Italy, to construct a plant in the Soviet Union. The Fiat Co. of Italy, it is reported, is seeking a \$50 million loan from the Export-Import Bank. If we pass this substitute amendment, for example, it would be impossible, in my opinion, to go ahead with the Fiat deal with the Soviet Union.

I believe it is time that we came down to the fact that the Export-Import Bank should not be making loans to countries dealing with Communist countries who are supporting the Communist effort in North Vietnam against our best interests. That is the reason I have offered this substitute amendment to the House. It would in no way restrict the activities of the Export-Import Bank in worthwhile transactions. I know and believe the Export-Import Bank is a good organization which has done great good throughout the world.

But I see no value in the Export-Import Bank dealing with countries that deal with Communist countries which support the Communist war effort.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. May I inquire, is not the thrust of the amendment, stating no determination and no exception, essentially what the chairman of the committee recommended in other sections of the bill relating to the sale of arms?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. The whole debate today has revolved around this particular question. The debate the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] gave in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee was just the reverse of what has been going on in the Committee of the Whole all day. Therefore, I took the whole issue out of this bill by recommending deleting the entire section that referred to a Presidential determination.

Mr. BROCK. Will the gentleman yield for an additional comment?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield.

Mr. BROCK. I support the gentleman's amendment. It is perfectly acceptable to me.

What we are saying, with all respect to the leadership, which has pointed out that the President should have this authority, is that my point is he has already made the determination that assistance to the Communist bloc is in the national interest of this country. I happen to disagree. Therefore, I believe we need this amendment. I believe it is imperative.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. He has been very active and effective in his work on this matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman aware that under section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, there is discretionary authority to the President, and this provision in the bill apparently impinges upon section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961? I fear the discretionary authority is left to the President, even with the gentleman's amendment. I want very much to support the gentleman's amendment and I hope it will not be nullified.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I believe it would be worthwhile that we adopt the substitute amendment which has been offered, and we would be on the right track.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. With reference to the comment made by the gentleman from Iowa, I do not care whether it is in the Foreign Assistance Act or not. If a limitation is imposed on these funds, they could not be used.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment. This language has been carried in the appropriation bill in identical form since December 1963. There have been no abuses that I know of.

We cross over this bridge annually, not only in our debate on this floor, but also in conference. This Bank is operated solely to promote the sale of American commodities overseas. The Bank makes a profit every year and in addition we get back badly needed dollars.

Of course, there is a lot of political mileage in this proposition, but I must face up to my responsibility as the representative of the committee that reported this bill to the House for its consideration, and I urge the Committee to vote down this amendment.

In addition, it is just a matter of weeks now, in all probability, before there will be legislation tightening this up, more or less, and, in all probability, proposing the adoption of at least one of the amendments offered today.

I trust that the substitute amendment will be voted down, and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the

gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LIPSCOMB) there were—ayes 49, noes 63.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. LIPSCOMB and Mr. PASSMAN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 58, noes 78.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROCK

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROCK: On page 20, lines 9 and 10, strike the word "within" and all that follows through line 10 and insert in lieu thereof "at least 30 days prior to such determination."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BROCK. Certainly.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, have we not already passed that part of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Louisiana that we have not passed that part of the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished Chairman.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, if I may say to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], what I am trying to do, since the last amendment was defeated, is to at least give to the Congress advance notice before any decisions are made.

All I am saying is that instead of informing us after the fact, inform us 30 days prior to making such a determination.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCK. Certainly.

Mr. PASSMAN. I think it would be almost impossible to administer such an amendment, would it not?

Mr. BROCK. No; there is no difficulty in this amendment. All they have to do is to advise the Congress 30 days prior to making any such decision.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, how can they advise us 30 days prior to the day they make the determination?

Mr. BROCK. The point is, in response to the gentleman from Louisiana, I want the Congress apprised of the fact that this determination is going to be made. Then, if there is any objection on the part of the membership of the House of Representatives, we can take specific action as required because we would have advance notice, instead of being informed after the fact.

Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that this amendment needs any further discussion and, therefore, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask



unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, practically every measure we consider these days can be related, in some fashion, to the military, diplomatic, and financial dilemma we face in Vietnam.

This was certainly true, earlier this week, when the House voted—and many who did so probably with misgivings—to hold the authorization for the anti-poverty program at approximately last year's level of funding.

Interrelated to all this, of course, is that troubling question of Federal priorities—or national priorities, if one prefers—and there have been those who have suggested, and not without reason, that we have our sense of priorities mixed up when we continue to spend money, and a great deal of money, pursuing some sort of "solution"—the form of which our leaders are apparently not able to agree upon—to the bloody conflict in Vietnam, while so many of our domestic challenges go unfaced, and the needs of our own people go unmet.

Now, I do not here wish to engage in any debate, again, over "guns and butter"—or "guns or butter"—but the provisions made in this bill, the annual appropriation bill for foreign aid, for carrying on that "other war" in Vietnam, as we have come to think of it, and the extremely lucid and logical comments made about this on yesterday by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] impel me to suggest, as he has, that we had better look to our priorities in Vietnam, too, so long as we are so deeply entangled there.

As for myself, I have felt all along—as our involvement in Vietnam lengthened and deepened—that this was still a war that, in the long run, would be won or lost by the people of South Vietnam. And I have, on numerous occasions, expressed my concern over the manner in which we have been "Americanizing" that "other war" in Vietnam—the political contest with Vietcong—as well as the shooting war which, perhaps, in view of the inadequacies of the South Vietnamese Army, was the only way by which we had a chance to halt the continued aggression from the north, and give the people of the south their long-awaited opportunity to set up a viable government of their own through which they might preserve their right to self-determination.

But to also "Americanize" the political side of this conflict—no matter how pressing the need to do so might seem—is quite another thing. General Westmoreland is now, again, in Washington and has been giving both President and Congress a rather subdued report of such military progress as is being made; and there is even talk again that, after a year or two, we might even begin to be able to reduce our troop strength in Vietnam—though this is a message of hope we have heard before.

However, it is a good deal harder for anyone in behalf of the administration

to point to any reason for encouragement concerning the political side of the war—and one only has to read through some of the hearings conducted by the subcommittee that prepared this bill to discover the reasons why. On September 19—if you are looking for ready reference material in this respect—the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] addressed this committee at some length on this facet of our Vietnamese problem, including excerpts from the testimony he had heard as a member of that subcommittee, and including especially excerpts of the various colloquies he had had with Rutherford M. Poats, formerly area director of the AID program in Vietnam and now Deputy Director of AID.

There is no need for me to repeat what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] set forth, for it is there in the RECORD for anyone to check, but it adds up to a very discouraging picture displaying a lack of self-sufficiency, a lack of motivation, a lack of resolve and a lack of commitment, so far, on the part of the South Vietnamese people—though this is surely not solely the fault of these people who have been pushed hither and yon for years, with no government and no leader really to rally around. But now, they have a duly elected government of their own, in which they should have, for the first time, some faith, and it would seem to me to be essential—if we are ever to dig ourselves out of this morass—that we require of that new government the doing of those things that it must do if this rugged experiment at trying to build something like democracy in Asia on which we have embarked is to possibly succeed.

Those things that it must do are not terribly complex, though undoubtedly difficult in the application. They involve such items as a meaningful program of land reform—without which the peasants in the South Vietnamese hinterlands will never identify either with the new government or with the war; a program of tax reform and of internal economic controls of the kind, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] said yesterday, normally "would be associated with a country at war or on a wartime footing"; a program to wipe out the graft and corruption in and around Saigon that has previously hampered the allied war effort and damaged the credibility of prior South Vietnamese governments, as well as a renewed and redirected pacification program in which the South Vietnamese, themselves, must take the leading part.

Of course, Mr. Poats' testimony to the subcommittee was given some time ago, and there may since have been some improvement, but at the time of the hearings he did tell the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] that—

We are still increasing the American participation in what are normally the host government responsibilities.

And he also agreed, in effect, with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] when he suggested to him that, without our AID program to South Vietnam—which amounts to some \$550 million in this bill—the South Vietnamese Govern-

ment would likely collapse and, for all intents and purposes, the war would be over.

Now, surely Mr. Chairman, this is a discouraging state of affairs, and I would certainly agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] that we ought to insist of the new Vietnamese Government that it give us a commitment—or give its own citizens a commitment, for it makes really very little difference—to the winning of this struggle, however that term may be defined, equal not in dollars but in depth of resolution to that already made by our own Government. What we ask—or what we should be asking—is only such a commitment, not an overnight miracle, for this new government has barely gotten on its feet and no one can now expect too much of it in the way of deeds. Perhaps we already have some such commitment but, if so, the President has not made it known to us; and if there is one, for there are some small signs of improvement, then I think the President should tell us about it as best he can in view of the diplomatic problems involved, for there are more and more Americans, I feel sure, who are beginning to feel that if the South Vietnamese Government and people lack the wherewithal in will and resolution to see this thing through, then indeed, we ought to immediately reexamine our own commitment to them for—at least on the civil side—this is still their war and they have to win it.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this to be a matter of utmost priority in connection with our effort in Vietnam, and I would suggest to those who are critical of the course the President has been following that it would be well for them to address themselves to this facet of our overall problem rather than to that well-worn debate over whether to bomb or not to bomb, which, to my way of thinking at this point, is not a question that has much to do with how we come out of this dilemma, or even with how soon we could begin to have hope of doing so.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, in the year 1, the world's population was 250 million. In 1630, it had increased to 500 million. In 1830, it had increased to 1 billion. In 1930, it had increased to 2 billion. In 1960, the population was 3 billion. In 1975, it is estimated to be and it will be 4 billion. In 1984, 5 billion, and in 1993, 6 billion.

In the year 2,000, it will be 7 billion. Between now—1967—and the year 2,000, there will be 7 billion babies born in the world, it is estimated by the Population Council. Of this 7 billion, one-half of this number of children will be unwanted.

Do we today wish to cut our Technical Assistance Act from \$210 million to \$180 million, when the \$30 million would help so much in population control. It is possible by improvements in agriculture and our population growth that the



world can support 5 billion people by the year 2000. It is extremely doubtful that it can support 7 billion people.

I ask today that the \$30 million which has been struck from the budget request be restored in order that the world may provide something near adequate food for the youngsters to be born in the 33 years between now and the year 2000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I will be unable to support the foreign assistance program presented to us today in the form of H.R. 13893, the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill of 1968. Because I feel very strongly that the United States has an obligation to contribute to the economic development of other nations requiring assistance, it is necessary that I justify my negative vote on this bill to my colleague in this House and to the people of this country.

There will be many others voting against this bill, many or most for motives that I do not share. There will be some who do not feel that this country has an obligation to help the poor nations of the world. I do not share this view. Some will vote against the bill because they feel we cannot afford economic assistance to other nations while we are at war in Vietnam and face a budget deficit approaching \$30 billion. I do not share this view. Some will vote against the bill because they feel that it is insufficient, or contains policy restrictions they oppose. I am sympathetic to their concern, but that alone would not cause my opposition.

Why, then, do I oppose the bill? Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill because it is not now, and has not been for many years, a foreign assistance bill. It is, instead, a U.S. military and economic policy assistance bill—dressed up with a few, and very few, trimmings of economic aid to the poor nations of the world. And as it has become less and less a program of assistance to the underdeveloped world, the U.S. policies which it actually does assist have become more and more policies which I cannot support.

Let us examine the \$2,196,555,000 proposed in title I of this bill as foreign assistance. The largest amount, totaling \$978,255,000 is composed of military assistance, \$365,000,000; supporting assistance, \$600,000,000; contingency, \$10,000,000; and State Department administrative expense for military programs, \$3,255,000. All military assistance to Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, and NATO have been previously taken out of the bill and put into DOD appropriations. To have left them in would have been to make patently clear to all that the foreign aid bill is, primarily, a vehicle of U.S. military policy. The amount that remains is there essentially to attract the votes of those who do not believe in foreign aid but who will support to the hilt anything that enhances our military role around the world. The supporting assistance item, which the naive might

consider to be for the benefit of the recipient country, is actually a device to lessen our own admitted overseas military expenses. It is defined quite clearly on page 15 of the report—Report No. 891, November 6, 1967—as:

Finances programs in nations where the United States has immediate foreign policy interests. It is provided primarily to build the defensive strength of less developed nations threatened by Communist expansion and to avert dangerous economic and political instability in sensitive areas.

This can be read as "provides economic help in maintaining the armies of friendly military dictatorships." Two-thirds or more of this money goes to Vietnam. Since most of the underdeveloped countries friendly to us cannot support the kind of military forces we encourage them to maintain, we not only have to pay the cost of their military, but the supporting infrastructure of ports, highways, airfields, communications, munitions works, et cetera, upon which the military forces depend for effectiveness in time of need. Our need, I must say, rather than their need. If this kind of work is done in an area such as the Ryukyus, the United States considers it as a regular DOD expense. If we do it in Thailand, or other similar situations, we call it "foreign assistance." Such hypocrisy in the name of foreign aid I most utterly reject.

The next largest amount is the category of "Development Loans," which amount to \$770,000,000. These are loans "which enable recipients to import U.S. goods and services essential to development which they cannot buy with their own scarce foreign exchange"—page 17, Report No. 891. In other words, these loans are to create markets for U.S. business—markets which would not otherwise be available. The U.S. Government, and the U.S. taxpayer, are creating captive markets for U.S. business, and in so doing are creating conditions ultimately harmful both to this country and the recipient nation. The U.S. will be harmed when it awakes to the realization that captive markets, bought by taxpayer dollars, are not a firm or helpful base on which to build economic relations with the underdeveloped world. The naive, or the cunning, who believe that our foreign assistance can or should be justified by the friends it buys us, will be rudely shocked that this large item of development loans turns out not to buy friendship but probably to create frustration and antagonism in the recipients. There are already poor countries of the world which are obligated to pay in interest on various types of development loans amounts approaching the direct economic assistance which they receive from the rich nations. This means they are approaching a condition of net outflow of foreign exchange in spite of their drastic need of a large net inflow. And as we continue with the development loan program this situation will get progressively worse. The poor countries can only afford to borrow money if they are in a position of rapidly increasing their GNP per capita. Practically none of them are. The loans become therefore a narcotic which will produce the illusion of

progress for a time, but not the reality. When the crisis comes they will, of necessity, be forced to repudiate their loans, thus placing great strains on their political and economic relations with the rich nations. Development loans, except under the most unusual conditions, constitute a form of U.S. economic imperialism which, in the near future will come to acquire the same odium in the underdeveloped world as the old fashioned brand of political and military imperialism. And the differences are not as large as might appear on the surface.

What now remains of our munificent foreign assistance program? Basically only the funds for technical cooperation, development grants, and contributions to international organizations, plus a few incidentals. These add up to \$448,300,000 or about 20 percent of the total. Although I have many criticisms of the administration of these particular funds, and of the heavyhanded way they are used as a tool of bankrupt foreign policy stands, I could be persuaded to support this expenditure. But when this 20 percent has to be taken along with an 80 percent which I cannot support, I can no longer close my eyes, hold my nose, and vote "aye."

What alternatives to foreign assistance exist as a means of solving the problems of the underdeveloped world? The first that I would suggest is a drastic curtailment of military expenditures in all poor countries. I would hope that the rich countries would set the example, but this is obviously unrealistic. Such expenditures take today about 5 percent of their gross national product, and is on the increase as world conditions become less stable. This figure, if applied instead to economic development, would provide almost precisely the amount which I have mentioned in other speeches as required to provide hope of economic progress sufficient to dampen the otherwise inevitable fires of violent revolution. Such a course can be achieved only if the rich nations cease to use the poor nations as proxies in the cold war, as we are doing in Vietnam, and many other parts of the world. Such a course requires a commitment to international peacekeeping, strengthening of the U.N. and the encouragement of gradual regional neutralization, with great power guarantees. I have referred to this in other remarks as establishing "Zones of Peace" around the world. A second alternative to foreign assistance is the simple one of establishing firm and adequate international price levels for the raw materials and food products which constitute the basic exports of the poor nations. A 10-percent increase in the market price of the commodities exported by the underdeveloped world would have added \$30 billion to their economies in the last 10 years, more than they have received from the United States and other foreign aid. This should be coupled with the removal of all artificial restrictions on the foreign trade of these nations. It has been generally true that market fluctuations in basic commodities have more than offset U.S. foreign assistance to many Latin American countries, and similar conditions prevail around the world. Correct-



ing these conditions would supply the foreign exchange necessary for economic development in many or most poor countries and would do so in a way that would create pride and self-sufficiency—vital ingredients in the development process.

I have reached the pessimistic conclusion that today the world is racing on a treadmill and each year falling further behind. Until we break lose from that treadmill, we face only worsening conditions and further tragedy. Our knee-jerk reaction to the clichés of the cold war are hastening the time of disaster. Our increasing corruption of the foreign assistance concept has the same effect.

For the most fundamental of all reasons, the survival of the human race, we must change our course. I ask my colleagues to begin now.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, throughout the 7 years I have spoken out and voted against both the foreign aid authorization and the foreign aid appropriation bills. I have done so because I concluded years ago, even before I came to Congress, that our Nation, even though it is the wealthiest and most prosperous nation in the history of civilization, could not financially afford such an expensive and burdensome program. I am not opposed to foreign aid as such. I believe there are innumerable instances where expenditures can well be made in the field of foreign aid. But the determination as to whether such an expenditure should be made should be based solely on the national interest of the United States. I have not believed that a nation with the huge national debt we have carried for the past two decades and the repeated annual deficits could afford such expenditures. My voice in opposition to this measure might be weary but I still believe my position is correct. With the exception of the Marshall plan the returns of the foreign aid program have not justified and are not now justifying the costs.

The Committee on Appropriations is to be commended for the reductions that it has made this year in the program. These reductions were dictated by the very serious financial situation now confronting us. The reductions, I submit, are still too small. How can we justify to the American people grants of almost \$5 million to four colleges and institutes in a foreign nation as shown on page 13 of the report? There is not a Member of this body who does not have a college in his district not in serious need of additional funds to administer its educational programs. How many of the Members have obtained that kind of grants for their own private and public colleges? The truth is they haven't even endeavored to satisfy these needs. There is no program authorizing such grants. Then, we also have the provision authorizing AID to pay up to 50 percent of the cost of surveys to evaluate investment opportunities in less developed countries. These are just a few of the excesses in which this Nation can not afford to indulge.

Mr. Chairman, I must again vote against this appropriation. Our national debt of \$340 billion, our anticipated def-

icit this year of almost \$30 billion, and our very serious balance-of-payments deficit which is severely aggravated by this measure leave me no other choice.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, before we finish our consideration of this bill, I would like to make note of one item which has been deleted, the \$714,000 for the Partners of the Alliance program. It is my hope that some provision can be made to keep this highly successful program in operation.

Thirty-three States and the District of Columbia are paired with 34 areas of 16 Latin American countries to form the Partners of the Alliance program. For example, we now have some 14 U.S. States working on a State-for-State basis in Brazil alone. For example, the State of Missouri is working with the state of Para, and the State of New Jersey is working with Alagoas. Three of our States—North Carolina, Arkansas, and Utah—are working in Bolivia. The total of nonadministrative Government money into this program over the past 3 years has been \$409,000 for transportation of people. As of last April the value of assistance from the private sector to Latin America has totaled \$7.3 million. This means a cost-to-benefit ratio of 1 to 17. This is a hard value figure and does not reflect the intangible benefits of people working with people.

We are sending at no cost to the Government in the form of contracts, experts and/or technicians in the fields of agriculture, business, industry, education, and public health. Our partner States send these experts to their corresponding partner areas for the cost of only a tourist round-trip ticket and per diem expenses for these volunteers. The \$714,000 deleted by the Appropriations Committee was to have been used for moving people with particular talents to aid in the process of development in Latin America. The program thus far has done more with less money than any other U.S. overseas program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with a recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13893) making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote de-

manded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 13893) to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the nays appeared to have it.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 135, nays 177, not voting 120, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

YEAS—135

Abernethy	Gross	Olsen
Adair	Grover	Pettis
Andrews,	Gubser	Poage
N. Dak.	Hagan	Poff
Ashbrook	Haley	Pool
Ashmore	Hall	Price, Tex.
Baring	Hammer-	Pryor
Battin	schmidt	Quillen
Bennett	Harsha	Randall
Betts	Harvey	Barlick
Blackburn	Henderson	Reifel
Blanton	Hosmer	Reinecke
Bow	Hungate	Roth
Bray	Hunt	Roudebush
Brinkley	Hutchinson	Roush
Brock	Ichord	Rumsfeld
Brown, Calif.	Jarman	Ruppe
Brown, Mich.	Jonas	Sandman
Broyhill, Va.	King, N.Y.	Satterfield
Buchanan	Kleppe	Saylor
Burton, Utah	Kornegay	Scherle
Bush	Kuykendall	Scott
Byrnes, Wis.	Kyl	Skubitz
Carter	Langen	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Latta	Smith, N.Y.
Clausen,	Lennon	Smith, Okla.
Don H.	Lipscomb	Snyder
Cleveland	Long, La.	Steiger, Ariz.
Collier	Lukens	Steiger, Wis.
Colmer	McClure	Stubblefield
Conable	McCulloch	Talcott
Cramer	McDonald,	Taylor
Cunningham	Mich.	Thompson, Ga.
Curtis	McMillan	Tuck
Davis, Ga.	Marsh	Vander Jagt
Dickinson	Meskill	Wampler
Dole	Miller, Ohio	Watson
Dorn	Minshall	Watts
Dowdy	Mize	Whalley
Duncan	Montgomery	Whitten
Fisher	Moore	Winn
Flynt	Morris, N. Mex.	Wyatt
Fulton, Pa.	Myers	Wylie
Gardner	Natcher	Wynan
Gathings	Nelsen	Zwach
Gettys	Nichols	
Goodling	O'Konski	



## NAYS—177

Albert	Giaino	O'Hara, Mich.
Anderson, Tenn.	Gibbons	O'Neal, Ga.
Ashley	Gonzalez	O'Neill, Mass.
Ayres	Goodell	Ottinger
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Passman
Blester	Griffiths	Patman
Bingham	Gude	Patten
Blatnik	Halpern	Pelly
Boggs	Hamilton	Pepper
Boland	Hanley	Perkins
Bolling	Hathaway	Philbin
Bolton	Hébert	Pickle
Brademas	Hechler, W. Va.	Pirnie
Brasco	Helstoski	Price, Ill.
Brooks	Hollifield	Quie
Brotzman	Holland	Rallsback
Burke, Mass.	Horton	Rees
Burleson	Irwin	Reid, N.Y.
Burton, Calif.	Jacobs	Reuss
Byrne, Pa.	Joelson	Rhodes, Pa.
Cabell	Johnson, Calif.	Riegle
Cahill	Jones, Ala.	Roberts
Casey	Jones, Mo.	Robison
Cohelan	Karsten	Rogers, Colo.
Conte	Karsh	Ronan
Corbett	Kastenmeier	Rooney, N.Y.
Corman	Kazen	Rooney, Pa.
Culver	Keith	Rosenthal
Daddario	Kelly	Roybal
Daniels	King, Calif.	St Germain
Delaney	Kupferman	Scheuer
Dellenback	Kyros	Schweiker
Dent	Leggett	Selden
Diggs	Lloyd	Shriver
Donohue	Long, Md.	Sikes
Dow	McCarthy	Sisk
Downing	McDade	Smith, Iowa
Dulski	McFall	Springer
Dwyer	Machen	Stafford
Eckhardt	Madden	Stanton
Edwards, Calif.	Mahon	Steed
Edwards, La.	Mailliard	Stratton
Eilberg	Mathias, Calif.	Sullivan
Erlenborn	Matsunaga	Teague, Calif.
Esch	May	Teague, Tex.
Evans, Colo.	Mayne	Tunney
Fallon	Miller, Calif.	Ullman
Fascell	Minish	Van Deerlin
Feighan	Mink	Vanik
Flood	Monagan	Vigorito
Foley	Moorhead	Waggonner
Ford, Gerald R.	Morse, Mass.	Waldie
Ford,	Morton	Whalen
William D.	Moss	White
Fraser	Multer	Widnall
Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Ill.	Wolf
Friedel	Murphy, N.Y.	Yates
Galifianakis	Nedzi	Young
Garmatz	Nix	Zablocki
	O'Hara, Ill.	

## NOT VOTING—120

Abbt	Fountain	Pollock
Adams	Fulton, Tenn.	Pucinski
Addabbo	Fuqua	Purcell
Anderson, Ill.	Gallagher	Reid, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.	Gilbert	Resnick
Annunzio	Gray	Rhodes, Ariz.
Arends	Green, Oreg.	Rivers
Aspinall	Gurney	Rodino
Bates	Halleck	Rogers, Fla.
Belcher	Hanna	Rostenkowski
Bell	Hansen, Idaho	Ryan
Berry	Hansen, Wash.	St. Onge
Bevill	Hardy	Schadeberg
Broomfield	Harrison	Schneebell
Brown, Ohio	Hawkins	Schwengel
Broyhill, N.C.	Hays	Shipley
Burke, Fla.	Heckler, Mass.	Slack
Button	Herlong	Staggers
Carey	Hicks	Stephens
Celler	Howard	Stuckey
Chamberlain	Hull	Taft
Clancy	Johnson, Pa.	Tenzer
Clark	Jones, N.C.	Thompson, N.J.
Clawson, Del.	Kee	Thomson, Wis.
Conyers	Kirwan	Tiernan
Cowger	Kluczynski	Udall
Davis, Wis.	Laird	Utt
Dawson	Landrum	Walker
de la Garza	McClary	Watkins
Denney	McEwen	Whitener
Derwinski	Macdonald, Mass.	Wiggins
Devine	MacGregor	Williams, Miss.
Dingell	Martin	Williams, Pa.
Edmondson	Mathias, Md.	Willis
Edwards, Ala.	Meeds	Wilson, Bob
Eshleman	Michel	Wilson,
Everett	Mills	Charles H.
Evins, Tenn.	Morgan	Wright
Farbstein	Mosher	Wyder
Findley	Pike	Zion
Fino		

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Everett for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina for, with Mr. Annunzio against.

Mr. Andrews of Alabama for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Hicks against.

Mr. Fountain for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Walker for, with Mr. Addabbo against.

Mr. Rogers of Florida for, with Mr. Gilbert against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Purcell against.

Mr. Bevill for, with Mr. Rodino against.

Mr. Whitener for, with Mr. Meeds against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Slack against.

Mrs. Reid of Illinois for, with Mr. Tiernan against.

Mr. Michel for, with Mr. Ryan against.

Mr. Watkins for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Zion for, with Mr. Arends against.

Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Mathias of Maryland against.

Mr. Wiggins for, with Mr. Schneebell against.

Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Taft against.

Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Pollock against.

Mr. Hansen of Idaho for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Button against.

Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina for, with Mr. Schwengel against.

Mr. Martin for, with Mr. Adams against.

Mr. Chamberlain for, with Mr. Carey against.

Mr. Clancy for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Belcher for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Edmondson against.

Mr. Cowger for, with Mr. Farbstein against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Gurney for, with Mrs. Green of Oregon against.

Mr. Burke of Florida for, with Mr. Gray against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Hanna against.

Mr. Davis of Wisconsin for, with Mrs. Hansen of Washington against.

Mr. Stuckey for, with Mr. Bates against.

Mr. Abbt for, with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Tenzer against.

Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, against.

Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. Wright against.

Mr. Derwinski for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.

Mr. Mosher for, with Mr. Pucinski against.

Mr. Edwards of Alabama for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.

Mr. Eshleman for, with Mr. Pike against.

Mr. Findley for, with Mr. Clark against.

Mr. Schadeberg for, with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Howard against.

Mr. McClary for, with Mr. Hardy against.

Mr. McEwen for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Kee against.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi for, with Mr. Resnick against.

Mr. Mills for, with Mr. Udall against.

Mr. Stephens for, with Mr. Wyder against.

Mrs. BOLTON and Mr. SISK changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HOSMER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 167, nays 143, answered "present" 2, not voting 120, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

## YEAS—167

Albert	Garmatz	Nedzi
Anderson, Tenn.	Giaino	Nix
Ashley	Gibbons	O'Hara, Ill.
Ayres	Gonzalez	O'Hara, Mich.
Barrett	Goodell	O'Neill, Mass.
Blester	Gray	Ottinger
Bingham	Green, Pa.	Passman
Blatnik	Griffiths	Patman
Boggs	Gude	Patten
Boland	Halpern	Pelly
Bolling	Hamilton	Pepper
Bolton	Hanley	Perkins
Brademas	Hathaway	Philbin
Brasco	Hébert	Pickle
Brook	Hechler, W. Va.	Pirnie
Brooks	Helstoski	Price, Ill.
Brotzman	Hollifield	Quie
Burke, Mass.	Holland	Rallsback
Burton, Calif.	Horton	Rees
Byrne, Pa.	Irwin	Reid, N.Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jacobs	Reuss
Cabell	Joelson	Rhodes, Pa.
Cahill	Johnson, Calif.	Riegle
Cohelan	Karsten	Robison
Conable	Karsh	Rogers, Colo.
Conte	Kastenmeier	Ronan
Corbett	Kazen	Rooney, N.Y.
Culver	Keith	Rooney, Pa.
Daddario	Kelly	Rosenthal
Daniels	King, Calif.	Roybal
Delaney	Kupferman	St Germain
Dellenback	Kyros	Scheuer
Dent	Leggett	Schweiker
Diggs	Lloyd	Selden
Donohue	Long, Md.	Shriver
Dow	McCarthy	Sisk
Downing	McDade	Smith, Iowa
Dulski	McFall	Stafford
Dwyer	Machen	Stratton
Eckhardt	Madden	Sullivan
Edwards, Calif.	Mahon	Teague, Calif.
Eilberg	Mailliard	Teague, Tex.
Erlenborn	Mathias, Calif.	Tunney
Esch	Matsunaga	Ullman
Evans, Colo.	Mayne	Van Deerlin
Fallon	Miller, Calif.	Vanik
Fascell	Minish	Vigorito
Feighan	Mink	Waldie
Flood	Monagan	Whalen
Ford, Gerald R.	Moorhead	White
Ford,	Morse, Mass.	Widnall
William D.	Morton	Wolf
Fraser	Moss	Yates
Frelinghuysen	Multer	Young
Friedel	Murphy, Ill.	Zablocki
Fulton, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.	

## NAYS—143

Abernethy	Bush	Gathings
Adair	Carter	Gettys
Andrews,	Casey	Goodling
N. Dak.	Cederberg	Gross
Ashbrook	Cleveland	Grover
Ashmore	Colmer	Gubser
Baring	Cramer	Hagan
Battin	Cunningham	Haley
Bennett	Curtis	Hall
Betts	Davis, Ga.	Hammer-
Blackburn	Dickinson	schmidt
Blanton	Dole	Harsha
Bow	Dorn	Harvey
Bray	Dowdy	Henderson
Brinkley	Duncan	Hosmer
Brown, Calif.	Edwards, La.	Hungate
Brown, Mich.	Fisher	Hunt
Broyhill, Va.	Flynt	Hutchinson
Buchanan	Foley	Ichord
Burleson	Galifianakis	Jarman
Burton, Utah	Gardner	Jonas

Jones, Ala.	Myers	Sikes
Jones, Mo.	Natcher	Skubitz
King, N.Y.	Nelsen	Smith, Calif.
Kleppe	Nichols	Smith, N.Y.
Kornegay	O'Konski	Smith, Okla.
Kuykendall	Olsen	Snyder
Kyl	O'Neal, Ga.	Stanton
Langen	Pettis	Steed
Latta	Poage	Steiger, Ariz.
Lennon	Poff	Steiger, Wis.
Lipscomb	Pool	Stubblefield
Long, La.	Price, Tex.	Talcott
Lukens	Pryor	Taylor
McClure	Quillen	Thompson, Ga.
McCulloch	Randall	Tuck
McDonald, Mich.	Rarick	Vander Jagt
McEwen	Relfel	Waggonner
McMillan	Reinecke	Wampler
Marsh	Roberts	Watson
May	Roth	Watts
Meskill	Roudebush	Whalley
Miller, Ohio	Roush	Whitten
Minshall	Ruppe	Winn
Mize	Sandman	Wyatt
Montgomery	Satterfield	Wylie
Moore	Saylor	Wyman
Morris, N. Mex.	Scherle	Zwach
	Scott	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Collier	Rumsfeld
	NOT VOTING—120

Abbutt	Farbstein	Pollock
Adams	Findley	Pucinski
Addabbo	Fino	Purcell
Anderson, Ill.	Fountain	Reid, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.	Fulton, Tenn.	Resnick
Annunzio	Fuqua	Rhodes, Ariz.
Arends	Gallagher	Rivers
Aspinall	Gilbert	Rodino
Bates	Green, Oreg.	Rogers, Fla.
Belcher	Gurney	Rostenkowski
Bell	Halleck	Ryan
Berry	Hanna	St. Onge
Bevill	Hansen, Idaho	Schadeberg
Broomfield	Hansen, Wash.	Schneebell
Brown, Ohio	Hardy	Schwengel
Broyhill, N.C.	Harrison	Shipley
Burke, Fla.	Hawkins	Slack
Button	Hays	Springer
Carey	Heckler, Mass.	Staggers
Celler	Herlong	Stephens
Chamberlain	Hicks	Stuckey
Clancy	Hull	Taft
Clark	Johnson, Pa.	Tenzer
Clausen,	Jones, N.C.	Thompson, N.J.
Don H.	Kee	Thomson, Wis.
Clawson, Del.	Kirwan	Tiernan
Conyers	Kluczynski	Udall
Corman	Laird	Utt
Cowger	Landrum	Walker
Davis, Wis.	McClory	Watkins
Dawson	Macdonald,	Whitener
de la Garza	Mass.	Wiggins
Denney	MacGregor	Williams, Miss.
Derwinski	Martin	Williams, Pa.
Devine	Mathias, Md.	Willis
Dingell	Meeds	Wilson, Bob
Edmondson	Michel	Wilson,
Edwards, Ala.	Mills	Charles H.
Eshleman	Morgan	Wright
Everett	Mosher	Wylder
Evins, Tenn.	Pike	Zion

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Rumsfeld against.

Mr. Pucinski for, with Mr. Collier against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Evins of Tennessee against.

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Everett against.

Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Andrews of Alabama against.

Mr. Hicks for, with Mr. Hull against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Fountain against.

Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Walker against.

Mr. Gilbert for, with Mrs. Reid of Illinois against.

Mr. Purcell for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. Rodino for, with Mr. Watkins against.

Mr. Meeds for, with Mr. Zion against.

Mr. Slack for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Tiernan for, with Mr. Wiggins against.

Mr. Ryan for, with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Hansen of Idaho against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Rogers of Florida against.

Mr. Mathias of Maryland for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Schneebell for, with Mr. Bevill against.

Mr. Taft for, with Mr. Whitener against.

Mr. Pollock for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Harrison against.

Mr. Button for, with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Martin against.

Mr. Schwengel for, with Mr. Chamberlain against.

Mr. Adams for, with Mr. Anderson of Illinois against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Cowger against.

Mr. Bates for, with Mr. Clancy against.

Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Belcher against.

Mr. Carey for, with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona against.

Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Edmondson for, with Mr. Gurney against.

Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. Burke of Florida against.

Mr. Wylder for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. MacGregor for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Tenzer for, with Mr. Stuckey against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Abbutt against.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Fuqua against.

Mr. Wright for, with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Shipley against.

Mr. Pike for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. Mosher against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Edwards of Alabama against.

Mr. Hardy for, with Mr. Eshleman against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Findley against.

Mr. Kee for, with Mr. Schadeberg against.

Mr. Udall for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. McClory against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Utt against.

Mrs. Green of Oregon for, with Mr. Williams of Mississippi against.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington for, with Mr. Mills against.

Mr. Springer for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Mr. Corman for, with Mr. de la Garza against.

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Denney against.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski]. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rostenkowski]. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF NOVEMBER 20

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the agenda for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the remaining program for the week is the consideration of the rule on H.R. 8. The consideration of the bill itself, if the rule is adopted, will go over to a later date.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It was my understanding that there may be a conference report from the Committee on Armed Services on some bill. Is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] did speak to me about one.

The SPEAKER. The Chair might state that there have been scheduled a couple of unanimous-consent matters, one with respect to Senate amendments and the other one on a matter to go to conference.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, will the minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority leader. Is there great urgency for the consideration of this rule to be considered at 5:35 o'clock on Friday night?

Mr. ALBERT. The matter is one of high privilege. It has been worked out with the leadership on both sides, and if the rule is adopted, we can put over the consideration of the bill until after the Thanksgiving holidays.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. This is something you feel is of high urgency that must be taken up now?

Mr. ALBERT. It has been programmed, and it is a matter of privilege. I should say the consideration of the rule is in order at this time and it has been on the program.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to all concerned, I think this situation should be understood. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules some time ago served notice that



he was going to call up the rule under the rules of the House. The reason that the matter is being considered now—and I have his permission so to state—is that he is insisting on his right as a member of the Committee on Rules to call up the rule.

Mr. ALBERT. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, because it is an exact statement of the situation.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri stated the facts correctly. This bill has been reported out of the committee for months. It passed this House by a vote of about 5 to 1 last year and no action was taken thereon. It has been hanging fire here, and I did exercise my privilege as a Member of this House under the rules of the House by serving notice some weeks ago that if it were not programed, I would exercise the privilege of calling it up.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan will yield further, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his comments.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma as to the program for next week?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield, the program for next week is as follows:

For Monday and the balance of the week we have for the consideration of the House eight suspensions and 11 District bills which are as follows:

H.R. 13933, to authorize modifications in the Interstate System;

H.R. 8376, to provide that the U.S. District Court for Eastern District of New York shall be held at Brooklyn and Mineola, N.Y.;

H.R. 12010, to grant the consent of the United States to the Wheeling Creek Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention District compact;

H.R. 9063, to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949;

S. 1003, to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act;

H.R. 11527, to release conditions in a deed conveying land to the University of Maine;

H.R. 13489, to amend the Federal Credit Union Act;

H.R. 13273, to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966;

H.R. 6647, to authorize inspection of foreign-registered motor vehicles in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 9606, to exempt from taxation property of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America;

H.R. 12019, to exempt from taxation property of the B'nai B'rith Henry Monksky Foundation;

H.R. 10337, to amend District of Columbia Minimum Wage Act;

H.R. 13401, to amend Chanceries Act to clarify agreements with the government of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 13402, to authorize certain buildings for chanceries;

H.R. 13403, to amend grandfather clause regarding locations of chanceries;

H.R. 13480, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act;

S. 1227, to provide for recordation of judgments or decrees of the U.S. District Court for District of Columbia;

S. 764, to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act; and

S. 770, to amend the act establishing a public crematorium in the District of Columbia.

Also, for Monday we have, of course, the call of the Consent Calendar; and

S. 1031, to amend the Peace Corps Act, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate;

House Joint Resolution 859, to extend the emergency provisions of the urban mass transportation program, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate; and

H.R. 12603, National Visitor Center Facilities Act of 1967, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

On Tuesday will be the call of the Private Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, I might add we expect to complete the consideration of this legislative program by Tuesday evening.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield to me at this point?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I noted that there are a number of bills on the Consent Calendar, before we get into the consideration of the bills which are scheduled to be considered under suspension of the rules. This represents a rather long list and on which during the consideration thereof it will probably require many long hours of consideration.

Also, I notice on the list a long list of legislation for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, it is even more apparent than actually the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] indicated in announcing the program for Monday and the balance of the week, that we have a rather large and busy program for next week, a program which will take us beyond "turkey-eating time."

I also notice, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have scheduled for the consideration of the House H.R. 8, the very bill which we have been discussing and on which a discussion has especially been had by the distinguished members of the House Committee on Rules.

Could the gentleman from Oklahoma give us any idea, since we are going to take up the rule providing for the consideration of this bill tonight, when such bill might be programed, if the rule is adopted?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield further to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, that is a

matter which we will have to discuss with the author of the bill, the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield further, I think it is a matter of interest to the Members of the House, inasmuch as we are going to discuss the rule and evidently are going to pass it late on Friday evening, or at least consider it, whether the bill provided for under the rule might be scheduled at this session or the next session of Congress.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly satisfied that the committee and the majority leadership will take care of this matter in a satisfactory manner insofar as I am concerned, and I am not going to ask tonight when they are going to schedule it. However, I am satisfied that they are going to schedule it for the consideration of the House.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield further, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his faith, and greater faith than this hath no man.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, recognizing the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules has certainly and properly exercised the rights which are his prerogatives to call up this rule, as a practical matter I can see no sense at this hour in taking up the rule when the bill is not even scheduled for the consideration of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I think most Members of the House feel that way.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield further to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] may not be able to see any logic in taking up the rule at this time, but the gentleman may not be able to see everything that is involved.

Mr. COLLIER. Well, I am not unique in that respect, although it does seem to me that this represents a most unique approach to the situation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have some assurance that if we are going to take up this rule tonight we ought to have some assurance that this bill will be considered by the House of Representatives.

Mr. ALBERT. As far as I am concerned, if the gentleman will yield further, there is no intention to hoodwink anybody. The distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, under the rules of the House served notice that he was going to call this matter up. The leadership had hoped this could be done at a time that could accommodate the entire legislative program. The gentleman has agreed to do

this, and that is why it is being called up now.

Mr. GROSS. But of course it is up to the distinguished majority leader and the Speaker to program it.

Now, may we have the assurances that this bill will be considered after the Thanksgiving holiday this year?

Mr. ALBERT. It will be considered, as far as I am concerned, this year, because it is a privileged matter and the leadership has been notified that it would be called up.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the heavy program on Monday, in order to handle it could we ask unanimous consent that we come in at about 9 o'clock in the morning on Monday, and work until midnight?

Did someone object?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I trust that the Members in their wisdom will study the various bills which are on the program and give them careful consideration, and I believe after such consideration they will understand that the Speaker, in putting down these bills for suspension, has used wise discretion in that these are matters that should be considered under suspension of the rules, and I am sure that the House will cooperate with us in expediting the business of the House.

Mr. CEDERBERG. If the gentleman will yield further, I was being somewhat facetious with that statement, but I do believe there is some merit in coming in a little earlier on a day like that, either at 11 o'clock a.m., or at 10 o'clock a.m., because otherwise we can be working until 10 or 11 o'clock that night, and if we could come in a little bit earlier I would believe it would be better for all.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will bear with me, I will be glad to discuss the matter with the leadership on the other side at an appropriate time, and come to a decision on that before we adjourn tonight.

#### DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8, TO AMEND THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 509 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 509

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of my colleagues, as far as I am concerned the hour will not be used. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say with all possible emphasis that I have no apologies to offer to anyone for the action that I have taken in this matter. Yes, the hour is late. I hope the Members will bear in mind that it is also late in Vietnam. I hope the Members will also bear in mind that, while they may be a bit inconvenienced here today, they do not have to wade through the mire and the muck and the swamps of Vietnam like those boys whom we have drafted and sent over there while some people over in this country are sabotaging the efforts those boys are putting forth over there, and for which they are shedding their precious blood.

This bill was considered late in the session last year just before the Congress adjourned. It passed this House by a vote of 275 to 64. Because of the lateness of the session or because of the misguided thinking possibly of some people, the other body did not consider the bill.

Your Committee on Un-American Activities reported this bill on May 31, 1967, and it has been languishing here ever since. If you think this is strong language on my part, let us see what the bill would do, just briefly. The immediate purpose of the activity on the part of these people I have just referred to is to strengthen the Communist forces engaged in armed conflict with the United States, while at the same time obstructing the Government of the United States and its armed forces in the execution of their commitments in Vietnam, so as to facilitate the seizure of South Vietnam by Communist agencies.

I want to repeat what I have said a hundred times more or less in this House and elsewhere. I do not know whether we should be in Vietnam or not. But the fact is that we are there, and the fact is that our boys, your boys from your home town and my home town, are over there. Only last Saturday I dedicated a building, an armory, to two of the boys who had died there.

What would this measure do? It would

stop such action as occurred out on the west coast last year when some of these people—call them pacifists, call them anything you want to—actually laid down on the tracks to prevent the movement of troops, while others were gathering material and money to send over to the enemy. This bill is designed to stop that kind of activity.

A great American once said something to the effect, "My country right or wrong but my country" That is my attitude.

Something should be done about this. Why is there such a division in this country? Why do we have marches on the Pentagon? I believe that one of the reasons is the appeasement policy that has been followed in this country by those misguided people.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to keep my word. I am not going to speak at length on this subject. Those of you who want to go home and explain to your constituents, to the mothers and the fathers of these boys over there, that you were not willing to protect them here on the home front can do so.

But so far as I am concerned, I am going to give them every ounce of protection that I can.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield the usual 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN].

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Mississippi, the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee. It seems to me, too, that these boys in Vietnam—those living and those dead—are speaking to us today.

To you, from falling hands we throw  
The torch; be yours to hold it high  
If ye break faith with us who die,  
We shall not sleep.

As the able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has stated, House Resolution 509 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 8, entitled "Obstruction of Armed Forces."

The purpose of this bill is to prohibit certain actions against the Armed Forces of the United States when they are engaged in armed conflict, whether or not Congress has declared war.

Two broad categories of action are prescribed by the bill. Section 402 prohibits the solicitation, collection, or delivery of money or property to the foreign power engaging in the war with our forces. Section 403 prohibits the obstruction of either men or supplies for our military.

The bill as reported is identical with H.R. 12047 as it passed the House last October by a 275-to-64 vote. The Senate did not act on this measure.

The reasons for the bill are again detailed by the committee report. They include: First, continuing efforts by peacenik types throughout the country to collect money, supplies, and blood for the Vietcong; second, efforts by these same groups to disrupt the flow of supplies to our men in Vietnam; third, the belief that current laws are not adequate



to resolve these problems, a belief denied by a number of Federal agencies, who, nonetheless, do not prosecute violators of current law and seem to have no intention of doing so. Pages 9 through 11 list current law applicable and show the complete lack of utilization in this field of enforcement.

Officially, the Department of State, the Attorney General, the Department of Commerce, the Treasury, and the Army have all said the bill is not needed.

But it is needed.

To you, from falling hands we throw  
The torch; be yours to hold it high  
If ye break faith with us who die,  
We shall not sleep.

Dissenting views are submitted by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER]. He does not believe the bill is necessary and relies on the official stated positions noted above to sustain his position.

Mr. Speaker, when thousands of our finest young men are giving their lives in Vietnam, it is deplorable to think that anyone would give help to the enemy in any way. I feel very strongly that this legislation is badly needed and should be passed in order to afford some measure of protection for our fighting forces.

I know of no objection to the rule, and I urge that it be granted.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, the speaker now in the well of the House said the Attorney General of the United States says that this bill is not necessary. If this bill is not necessary, then how does he explain the fact he is allowing the war effort on the part of this Nation—whether he agrees with it or not—to be disrupted, such as military trains, military operations, by a march on the Pentagon, the most sensitive part of the Armed Forces of this Nation?

I just cannot understand Mr. Clark saying a bill of a similar character is not needed. If we had laws that could be enforced against this bunch of "goons" and "termites"—and that is what they are—then I believe he has been derelict in his duty in enforcing those laws and putting them in the penitentiary, where many of them belong.

Mr. QUILLLEN. I agree with the distinguished gentleman. I do not understand why not only the Attorney General but also the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of the Treasury all feel that this bill is unnecessary. They are not reaching out with their hearts in memory of these men fighting and dying for the red, white, and blue of our flag.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. QUILLLEN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HALEY. If Mr. Clark does not believe this bill is necessary, I wish he could have stood at the graveside of an only son of a very close friend of mine, only a few weeks ago. This was a boy I practically raised, a boy who had given his life in the defense of this Nation. I believe he gave it gladly, because he felt that was an obligation he owed. Let Mr. Clark go back and tell the mother of this

fine young man that a bill of this kind is not necessary.

Mr. QUILLLEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to speak even very briefly on this matter.

Things have been said which I believe should not be allowed to stand in the RECORD without some comment.

I happen to be a strong supporter of the U.S. action in Vietnam, as I was of our action in Korea.

I still believe it is possible for a person to disapprove of this bill and to oppose this bill and to be a perfectly loyal, committed, and dedicated citizen.

I merely wanted the record to show that no one challenged that remark.

Mr. QUILLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 212, nays 37, not voting 183, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

YEAS—212

Abernethy	Carter	Fulton, Pa.
Adair	Casey	Galifianakis
Albert	Cederberg	Garmatz
Andrews	Cleveland	Gathings
N. Dak.	Collier	Gettys
Ashbrook	Colmer	Gibbons
Ashmore	Conable	Gonzalez
Ayres	Conte	Goodell
Baring	Corbett	Goodling
Battin	Cramer	Gray
Bennett	Cunningham	Green, Pa.
Betts	Curtis	Gross
Blackburn	Daddario	Grover
Blatnik	Davis, Ga.	Gubser
Boggs	Dellenback	Hagan
Bow	Dickinson	Haley
Brademas	Dole	Hall
Brasco	Dorn	Halpern
Bray	Dowdy	Hammer-
Brinkley	Downing	schmidt
Brook	Dulski	Harsha
Brown	Duncan	Harvey
Brown, Mich.	Dwyer	Hébert
Broyhill, Va.	Edwards, La.	Henderson
Buchanan	Elberg	Horton
Burke, Mass.	Esch	Hosmer
Burleson	Evans, Colo.	Hungate
Burton, Utah	Feighan	Hunt
Bush	Fisher	Hutchinson
Byrne, Pa.	Flood	Ichord
Byrnes, Wis.	Flynt	Jacobs
Cabell	Ford, Gerald R.	Jarman
Cahill	Friedel	Joelson

Johnson, Calif.	O'Konski	Sisk
Jonas	O'Neal, Ga.	Skubitz
Jones, Ala.	Patman	Smith, Calif.
Kazen	Patten	Smith, Iowa
Keith	Pepper	Smith, N.Y.
King, N.Y.	Perkins	Smith, Okla.
Kleppe	Pettis	Snyder
Kyl	Pirnie	Stafford
Kyros	Poage	Stanton
Langen	Poff	Steed
Lennon	Pool	Steiger, Ariz.
Lipscomb	Price, Ill.	Steiger, Wis.
Long, La.	Price, Tex.	Stratton
Lukens	Pryor	Stubblefield
McCulloch	Quile	Talcott
McDade	Quillen	Taylor
McDonald,	Rallsback	Teague, Calif.
Mich.	Randall	Teague, Tex.
McEwen	Rarick	Tunney
Machen	Reifel	Vander Jagt
Mahon	Rhodes, Pa.	Vanik
Mailliard	Riegle	Vigorito
Marsh	Roberts	Wampler
Mathias, Calif.	Robison	Watson
Matsunaga	Rogers, Colo.	Watts
May	Rooney, N.Y.	Whalen
Mayne	Roth	Whalley
Meskill	Roudebush	White
Miller, Ohio	Roush	Whitten
Minish	Rumsfeld	Widnall
Minshall	Sandman	Winn
Mize	Satterfield	Wolf
Monagan	Saylor	Wyatt
Montgomery	Scherie	Wyllie
Moore	Schweiker	Wyman
Morton	Scott	Young
Myers	Selden	Zablocki
Natcher	Shriver	Zwach
Nichols	Sikes	

#### NAYS—37

Ashley	Hathaway	O'Hara, Mich.
Boland	Hechler, W. Va.	O'Neill, Mass.
Bolling	Helstoski	Rees
Brown, Calif.	Kastenmeier	Reid, N.Y.
Burton, Calif.	Kupferman	Reuss
Cohelan	Leggett	Rosenthal
Culver	Long, Md.	Roybal
Dow	McCarthy	St Germain
Eckhardt	McFall	Scheuer
Edwards, Calif.	Mink	Van Deerlin
Foley	Nedzi	Waldie
Ford,	Nix	Yates
William D.	O'Hara, Ill.	

#### NOT VOTING—183

Abbitt	Edwards, Ala.	Kluczynski
Adams	Erlenborn	Kornegay
Addabbo	Eshleman	Kuykendall
Anderson, Ill.	Everett	Laird
Anderson,	Evins, Tenn.	Landrum
Tenn.	Fallon	Latta
Andrews, Ala.	Farbstein	Lloyd
Annunzio	Fascell	McClure
Arends	Findley	McClure
Aspinall	Fino	McMillan
Barrett	Fountain	Macdonald,
Bates	Fraser	Mass.
Belcher	Frelinghuysen	MacGregor
Bell	Fulton, Tenn.	Madden
Berry	Fuqua	Martin
Bevill	Gallagher	Mathias, Md.
Biester	Gardner	Meeds
Bingham	Gialmo	Michel
Blanton	Gilbert	Miller, Calif.
Bolton	Green, Oreg.	Mills
Brooks	Griffiths	Moorhead
Broomfield	Gude	Morgan
Brown, Ohio	Gurney	Morris, N. Mex.
Broyhill, N.C.	Halleck	Morse, Mass.
Burke, Fla.	Hamilton	Mosher
Button	Hanley	Moss
Carey	Hanna	Multer
Celler	Hansen, Idaho	Murphy, Ill.
Chamberlain	Hansen, Wash.	Murphy, N.Y.
Clancy	Hardy	Nelsen
Clark	Harrison	Olsen
Clausen,	Hawkins	Ottinger
Don H.	Hays	Passman
Clawson, Del	Heckler, Mass.	Pelly
Conyers	Herlong	Philbin
Corman	Hicks	Pickle
Cowder	Hollifield	Pike
Daniels	Holland	Pollock
Davis, Wis.	Howard	Pucinski
Dawson	Hull	Purcell
de la Garza	Irwin	Reid, Ill.
Delaney	Johnson, Pa.	Reinecke
Denney	Jones, Mo.	Resnick
Dent	Jones, N.C.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Derwinski	Karsten	Rivers
Devine	Karth	Rodino
Diggs	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Dingell	Kelly	Ronan
Donohue	King, Calif.	Rooney, Pa.
Edmondson	Kirwan	Rostenkowski

Ruppe	Taft	Whitener
Ryan	Tenzer	Wiggins
St. Onge	Thompson, Ga.	Williams, Miss.
Schadeberg	Thompson, N.J.	Williams, Pa.
Schneebell	Thomson, Wis.	Willis
Schwengel	Tiernan	Wilson, Bob
Shipley	Tuck	Wilson,
Slack	Udall	Charles H.
Springer	Ullman	Wright
Staggers	Utt	Wydler
Stephens	Waggonner	Zion
Stuckey	Walker	
Sullivan	Watkins	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pucinski for, with Mr. Fraser against.  
Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Celler against.  
Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Ryan against.  
Mr. Fascell for, with Mr. Hawkins against.  
Mr. Kornegay for, with Mr. Resnick against.  
Mr. Fountain for, with Mr. Bingham against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Conyers against.  
Mr. Waggonner for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Hanna.  
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Hanley.  
Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Ottinger.  
Mr. Mills with Mr. Moorhead.  
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Olsen.  
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Holland.  
Mr. Karth with Mr. McMillan.  
Mr. Passman with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.

Mr. Irwin with Mr. Digs.  
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Howard.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Kee.  
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.  
Mr. Addabbo with Mrs. Bolton.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Arends.  
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Broomfield.  
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Chamberlain.  
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Devine.  
Mr. Carey with Mr. Bates.  
Mr. Adams with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.  
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Clancy.  
Mr. Daniels with Mr. Zion.  
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Button.  
Mr. King of California with Mr. Harrison.  
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Bell.  
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Don H. Clausen.  
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Erlenborn.  
Mr. Giallino with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.  
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Belcher.  
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Eshleman.  
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Del Clawson.  
Mr. Bevil with Mr. Berry.  
Mr. Madden with Mr. Gurney.  
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Derwinski.  
Mr. Moss with Mr. Brown of Michigan.  
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Findley.  
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Biester.  
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Fino.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Halleck.  
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Frelinghuysen.  
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Cowger.  
Mr. Hays with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.  
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Gude.  
Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Gardner.  
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Denney.  
Mr. Multer with Mr. Wyder.  
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Burke of Florida.  
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Bob Wilson.  
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Schneebell.  
Mr. Whitener with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.  
Mr. Udall with Mr. Kuykendall.  
Mr. Karsten with Mr. Watkins.  
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Ruppe.  
Mr. Rogers of Florida with Mr. Michel.  
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Reinecke.

OXIII—2078—Part 24

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Laird.  
Mr. Wright with Mr. Mosher.  
Mr. Corman with Mr. Wiggins.  
Mr. Slack with Mr. Latta.  
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Nelsen.  
Mr. Tuck with Mr. Utt.  
Mr. Hicks with Mr. Lloyd.  
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. McClory.  
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.  
Mr. Willis with Mr. McClure.  
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Mr. Taft.  
Mr. Everett with Mr. MacGregor.  
Mr. Walker with Mr. Springer.  
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Martin.  
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Morse.  
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Pelly.  
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Pollock.  
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.  
Mr. Pike with Mr. Schadeberg.  
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Ronan.  
Mrs. Griffiths with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.  
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. MONDAY,  
NOVEMBER 20, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, after consulting with the distinguished minority leader, and in response to petitions from some Members, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON  
H.R. 8629, TO AMEND THE ACT OF  
JULY 4, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8629) to amend the act of July 4, 1966, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROGERS of Colorado, WHITENER, JACOBS, POFF, and WIGGINS.

WEST POINT FOOTBALL TEAM CANNOT PARTICIPATE IN BOWL GAME

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I had not

intended to take the floor to discuss this matter today, but occurrences of the last few hours have compelled me to bring to your attention again a situation as related to the betrayal of the football team of West Point and the cadet corps and the Army in its entirety by the Secretary of the Army in surreptitiously ruling that the Army football team could not participate in a bowl game, and insinuating that it smacked of professionalism.

Since the news media carried this announcement, my telephone this morning has been ringing with calls of protest from people in all parts of the country.

The American people have been heard from and I am sure the people will continue to be heard from.

I am sure that those individuals who would shed crocodile tears on the over-emphasis, so-called, of football and athletics at West Point could well read again what perhaps one of the greatest West Pointers of all said about this competition:

Upon the fields of friendly strife, are sowed the seeds  
That in other days and other fields will bear the fruits of victory.

—DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

They shall also recall what the Duke of Wellington said after the Battle of Waterloo, that, "The Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton."

Another story that General MacArthur told is well known and bears repeating at this time. When he was a young aide with President Theodore Roosevelt, they were attending a football game. General MacArthur said just at the height of the game the President looked over at him and said, "Douglas, I would rather be the quarterback on that field than the President of the United States."

This is serious business that is going on now where reflection is cast on two other Academies, the Air Force Academy, which has participated in two bowl games, and the Naval Academy, which has participated in five bowl games. It is also an absolute affront to the Board of Visitors to West Point of 1955, which advised that the policy of the Academy should be to accept a bowl invitation.

The most damaging thing I think is the strike that has been made against the morale of the cadets. They were all led to believe that they would participate.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Will the gentleman tell us where West Point might play if it plays in a bowl game?

Mr. HÉBERT. I have every assurance and can say that West Point would have been in the Sugar Bowl Game at New Orleans if this prohibition had not been placed against them. The Cotton Bowl in Dallas was also interested in the West Point team, and they could have gone there. To the gentleman I can say if West Point had received an invitation from the Sugar Bowl and had been allowed to play in the Sugar Bowl its opponent could well have been Oklahoma, the



State so ably represented by our distinguished majority leader. I am sure if such had occurred my dear friend would have been there to cheer his old alma mater, the University of Oklahoma.

Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor and Chief of Staff Harold K. Johnson, in refusing to allow West Point to accept a football bowl invitation delivered a body-blow to the morale of the West Point football squad, the corps of cadets, and the entire Army.

This action is going to strike the match to the biggest fire of resentment that I can conceive. It was a precipitous decision by Secretary Resor and General Johnson. It was confirmed after I had made a personal plea to Secretary Resor and had pointed out to him that a policy of allowing the academies to participate in bowl games was set forth in the report of the 1955 Board of Visitors at West Point.

I discussed the matter at length with Secretary Resor on Tuesday afternoon. Today he called me at a quarter of 1 and informed me that he had not changed his position. He reaffirmed his decision and said an announcement would be made to the corps at 1 o'clock. I asked him to withhold the announcement until the matter could be discussed further and in depth. He said he could not do this. Of course, this *modus operandi* is typical of the Pentagon. When decisions are made, the Congress is only informed after the decision is made and the public announcement comes within minutes. This is par for the course.

In reference to the recommendation of the 1955 Board of Visitors, the Secretary said he questioned my interpretation of it. I informed him that I knew what the intent of the Board was because I was a member of the Board and had personally joined in the recommendation. Again, this is typical in so many departments of the Government telling Members of Congress what their intent was. In other words, they have a habit of reading our minds and coming up with answers that were never present.

The decision of 1955, made by a Board of Visitors chaired by Gen. Lucius Clay, had the full approval of Col. Earl H. Blaik, who was at that time athletic director and coach at West Point.

Secretary Resor told me that participating in bowl games smacks of professionalism. Is he charging the Air Force and Naval Academies with professionalism in athletics? Both the Naval Academy and the Air Force Academy have participated in several bowl games since 1955.

Secretary Resor also told me a bowl game would take players away from their studies too much. I pointed out to him that all other athletic teams at the Military Academy are invited and have participated in postseason contests such as invitational tournaments or elimination tournaments. The football player is being discriminated against.

He also advanced the specious argument of Vietnam. I think the young men in the Army in Vietnam would rather have an Army team in a bowl game to cheer for than a college team of boys

from their home State who are not giving any service to their country.

It must also be noted that participation in a bowl game is worth approximately \$250,000. It must further be noted that the entire athletic program at West Point is supported by football revenue. Not \$1 of taxpayers money or appropriated funds is used. The entire athletic program relies exclusively on gate receipts.

It is a mystery to me why the Secretary of the Army felt compelled to make a hasty decision against bowl games before an invitation was officially extended.

It is a mystery to me why the Secretary of the Army did not wish to at least first ascertain the desires of the members of the West Point football team and the cadet corps as a whole. It is my understanding that the players and the rest of the cadets were enthusiastic about participating in a bowl game.

It should be remembered that in a short while many of these young men will be commissioned junior officers and will be assigned to combat duty in Vietnam. The kind of combat duty a junior officer faces is the most dangerous kind, leading small units in actual fighting. It seems to me a shame that these young men could not be given the special joy of playing in a bowl game before going to such hazardous duty for their country.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services with jurisdiction over the three Military Academies, I have insisted and persistently made every effort to bring a uniform policy to each one of the three. I have succeeded in doing it thus far, and I will continue to pursue this policy in connection with the participation of the service academies in bowl games. The American people own the service academies, not individuals. The American people have a right to see the service teams in all its activities.

This action on the part of Secretary Resor and General Johnson will bring an outburst of indignation throughout the country and I hope it does because it will encourage the Congress to force needed changes.

#### RISE IN PRICES IS A TAX INCREASE

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, let us consider some examples of the impact on all of us of an additional rise of 3 percent in consumer prices which, using the Korean experience as a guide, might result in the absence of the surcharge.

The figures are very instructive.

A single individual with \$900 of money income would pay no surcharge; he would be exempt. But a 3-percent additional rise in prices would actually decrease the real income of this individual 4 percent since such a person typically must spend more than his meager income on current living, making up the difference by going into debt or drawing down

on savings. This would be equivalent to a 4-percent tax on his income.

For the single individual living on \$5,000, the surcharge would impose a tax of \$67, equal to 1.3 percent of his income. The burden of the additional 3-percent rise in prices would amount to \$144, equal to 2.8 percent of his income—a smaller relative burden than for the individual with \$900 income—but still be above the burden of the surcharge.

At the \$20,000 income level the surcharge burden would rise in relative terms to 2.5 percent of income and amount to \$492, while the additional 3-percent rise in prices would amount to \$540.

Turning to a family of four we again see the same unjust pattern of the burden distribution of inflation compared to the surcharge. At \$2,500 and at \$5,000 of family income no surcharge is paid. In contrast, the burden of the additional price rise is equal to \$82 or 3 1/3 percent of income at \$2,500, and \$147 or 3.1 percent at \$5,000.

At \$10,000 of family income, the surcharge would amount to \$111 or 1.1 percent of income. The burden of the 3 percent price rise would be \$285 or 2.9 percent.

Some individuals and families in each of these ranges will, of course, experience a rise in incomes when prices rise. These people would not be hurt as much by inflation as would others whose incomes are fixed, but in the end everyone loses. While the surcharge exempts entirely the low income families and individuals, the price rise would place its heaviest relative burden on families and individuals in the lowest income ranges.

But the overall result of a 3 percent additional price rise would be to diminish the real income of the overwhelming majority of the American people far more than the average loss of 1 percent flowing from the tax surcharge.

Moreover, the cost of inflation may be even greater than these annual comparisons indicate, because once a wage-price spiral begins it usually generates price increases every year for several years, while on the other hand, the surcharge is to be temporary, for so long as hostilities continue in Vietnam.

#### VIETNAM—"THE RIGHT PLACE, THE RIGHT TIME, THE RIGHT ENEMY"

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Vietnam is a prime force in our lives—it has been for some years and it shall continue to be for some time to come. Around such prime and major forces legends are built. Mythology develops. A myth is a story which repeated again and again takes on the aspect of truth even when the facts do not support such a conclusion.

Vietnam is a subject which evokes much discussion and exchanges of opinion. Some of this exchange these days is fact; some of it, mythology. We have



heard on the floor of the House these past few weeks much honest discussion but we have also heard much argument that is closer to myth than it is to rock bottom fact.

We have heard that this Nation seems bent upon a course of winning in Vietnam by the sheer and deliberate bombing of the north. We have heard that this Nation of ours is supporting a government of "landowners and military elite" who will never be able to provide strong national leadership. We are told that the people of Vietnam do not want to defend themselves and that its army does not want to fight. We are informed that there is no real progress in Vietnam, that we are stalemated, that something is wrong when we cannot achieve short term victory.

Given the ideas advanced in some of these myths, I would probably believe them too but from time to time we have to clear out the underbrush with a good solid whack and see what the facts really are. Let us look again at some of these myths:

Are we trying to win this war through more and more bombing?

The President in March of this year, in his letter to Senator HENRY M. JACKSON of the State of Washington, said the following:

We never believed aerial attack on North Vietnam would, alone, end the war. We did, however, have three objectives. The first was to back our fighting men and our fighting allies by demonstrating that the aggressor could not illegally bring hostile arms and men to bear against them from the security of a sanctuary.

Second, we sought to impose on North Vietnam a cost for violating its international agreements.

Third, we sought to limit or raise the cost of bringing men and supplies to bear against the south.

If there is anyone who believes the mythology that we can win in Vietnam by bombs lobbed in the north, they are misled. The position is clear. In a guerrilla, politico-military kind of conflict—as we see in Vietnam—weapons are only a part of the tools of the trade. We use what we can when we can. As Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge has often told us, there will be conflict as long as the guerrilla infrastructure is still in place.

We hear many reports of this new government in Saigon. We hear that it is a government of landowners, that it is a government of the military elite. There are landowners and military men in the government; certainly if we turn to this very House we will see that many of our own Members served through periods of emergency and some even professionally in our Armed Forces.

Vietnam has military men in her government. In a country which has been at war for more than 20 years, the military provided social mobility, a place where able men could excel and serve their country. Many of their military would have been farmers and teachers. Picture our country's professional men if World War II had been prolonged for another 15 years.

We can examine the membership of the new Senate recently elected. Eleven of the Senators are teachers; 11 are

military or former military; 11 are lawyers; eight merchants or industrialists; five doctors; three civil servants; one architect; two pharmacists; six engineers; one labor leader; one veterans organization leader. The youngest is 30; the oldest 71. The average age is 48.

The important and vital fact is that in the midst of an armed aggression the Vietnamese people went to the polls and elected men of their choice.

We have just seen that the province chief formerly of Binh Dinh has been sentenced on charge of corruption. We ask ourselves if this is going to be a real goal of this government, a cleaning of their own house in the midst of a regular "shooting war." They have promised this would be a goal and they have not even yet been allotted their 100 days. They have an upper and lower house now as well as an elected President and appointed Prime Minister. How will this system work—let us give them the time to activate their new institutions.

We are told that the people of South Vietnam do not want to be saved. We are told that its army does not want to fight. We are told that we should turn the war back to the Vietnamese. I do not accept these myths. Vietnam does want to be saved; its army is willing to fight to save it and we never have taken the "show" away from them. The war is still their war. Our advisers, if you should ask any of them, would say simply, they are there to "work themselves out of a job." Any viable nation-building, any rooting out of the guerrilla infrastructure—no matter how enlightened our advice—must be done by the South Vietnamese. This is nothing new. We have placed troops into that country to give the Vietnamese people an option, to give them a "fighting chance," to give them what we believe is an inherent right, to find their own road, elect their own government, pursue their own destiny.

In my book, the Republic of Viet-Nam Armed Forces have conducted themselves with credit.

General Westmoreland tells us—

As I tour the country several times a week, I am encouraged by the obvious improvement in the morale, proficiency and quality of their fighting forces.

Another general from another war, Gen. Omar Bradley said in the November 14 issue of Look magazine:

After tramping throughout the length and width of South Vietnam . . . I am convinced this is a war at the right place, at the right time and with the right enemy.

How many of us heard reports, real and imagined myths about the Korean troops with whom we shared foxholes in the conflict of the 1950's. We may have doubted the excellence of their army for a while then; we do not doubt it now. When leadership is given the opportunity to develop, these troops proved themselves many times over. Ask any man fighting with them in Vietnam about the effectiveness of Korean troops.

We hear we are wallowing in a stalemate. General Bradley, fresh from his trip to South Vietnam spoke to this:

I don't call it a stalemate when, almost everywhere the enemy is avoiding contact

and our troops are progressively digging him out and pushing him back. I don't call it stalemate when, by every measurement, the other side is getting weaker and we are getting stronger. The war is like no other in my experience. There are no great wall maps on which to draw lines and say, "Here is the front." The front is everywhere.

We are told there is little pacification progress. Progress in such a war is necessarily a slow moving thing. You cannot always read progress in the amount of enemy killed or the amount of school-houses built or roads improved or wells spilling water. Progress might be a Vietnamese agriculture chief responding to a farmer and the need for special fertilizer for the first time—not how many farmers attended a cooperative meeting. The reaction of a Vietnamese hamlet population to the destruction of a school-house they built in their own sweat and with their own labor is more important than the fact that we built 200 in one province in 14 months. We are beginning to accumulate an excellent record, numerically yes, but we do not accept the myth that all progress can be reported in statistics.

What was the progress recorded in American cities in the 1920's when gangs and gangsters ran rampant? What measurement did we make when the first private citizen protested the evils of the protection racket for the first time. What statistical machine is going to tell you what this very Congress will accomplish before adjournment?

The recent Israel victory has been proclaimed as a 6-day victory but General Dayan in his visits to the Vietnam front acknowledged that here were two different kinds of wars. He made it clear that neither he nor any other great soldier could win this one quickly.

We hear we are crying for victory. Who has heard that word being used? I have not. We have asked for an honorable settlement. The other side has so far chosen not to listen.

I remember a story presented in the Cecil B. DeMille film "The Crusades," that Richard the Lionhearted met Saladin in one of the battlefield tents. Richard had a sword powerful enough to split a table but Saladin had a scimitar with a cutting blade sharp enough to slice a length of silk veil in two. Here were two adversaries fighting two different kinds of war. Richard, if he were to win, would have had to change some of his strategy. He did not.

I think we will have to change some of our rules for measuring the progress of this war. One of the weapons the enemy can use against us is our impatience. This war calls for more patience and we Americans are an impatient people. This war calls for time, and we are not quite willing to allot that much time. I believe with General Bradley that this is a war at the right place, at the right time and with the right enemy.

In Vietnam we are a part of a sweeping revolution. We must harness its energies in partnership with the Vietnamese in order to build a nation resilient and durable and representative. We are not trying to impose our system but we would not take it unkindly if they felt that they could borrow some of our ideas of de-



mocracy and representation and old-fashioned fence mending.

It is a complex war and a long war and myths grow easily. We should look carefully into the myths we have begun to accept automatically and weigh and examine and consider them. There is non-productive doubt and there is positive and constructive doubting. There is honest questioning. There is constant reexamination of our objectives in light of the best information available. That is an axiom of sound government.

In this nation-building, in this defense of Vietnam in partnership with its people, what we need is a little time and a little patience and with these vital commodities I believe we shall prevail.

### PARKS ARE FOR PEOPLE

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, George B. Hartzog, Jr., Director of the National Park Service, was a participant in the program of the National Reclamation Association's annual convention in Honolulu, Hawaii.

At that time Mr. Hartzog delivered a thought-provoking speech challenging not only the National Reclamation Association, but the American people, to keep and preserve our National Park Systems for all of the people of the United States.

Mr. Hartzog's speech follows:

REMARKS BY GEORGE B. HARTZOG, JR.

I welcome the opportunity to appear as a part of this panel to express my viewpoints on the theme of your conference: Recreation and Resources—the New Accommodations.

I am delighted to share this platform with Mr. Michio Takata, Hawaii's widely known and highly respected Director of Fish and Game, who will speak on the effects of reclamation projects on fish and wildlife values.

Mr. Carroll Swearingen, the panel member from Texas, is one of the foremost authorities on water-related outdoor recreation, and he will discuss this subject as it relates to conflicting water uses.

Dr. William Siri from the University of California, and distinguished representative of the Sierra Club, will help all of us to better understand some of the complexities involved in accommodating competing needs in the use and preservation of natural resources.

It will be my privilege to highlight, briefly, some of the issues arising out of management of competing programs and the cost-benefit consideration involving our alternatives in resource use.

One might say that the ambition of this panel, as, indeed, the purpose of this conference, is to seek solutions to the question which conservation poses today: shall we have a living environment, or must we accept living conditions which steadily deteriorate?

The great poet Robert Frost once said, with the characteristic wisdom of a man who has lived close to nature, "What makes a nation in the beginning is a good piece of geography."

As a Nation, we have been blessed with the greatest and richest piece of geography

on earth. I doubt that many of you here, and I believe you are predominantly Westerners, would take issue with the statement that the richest and most spectacular of these blessings lie in the great Western part of our country, distributed lavishly but perhaps inequitably among the Western states.

It is a coincidence of nature, geography, and our national growth pattern that two of the great conservation agencies—the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service—both have their origins in the West.

Yellowstone in Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho, was established by Congress in 1872 as our first National Park to protect its unique thermal features, its abundant wildlife, and its scenic lakes, rivers, and gorges. Yosemite in California was established soon after.

Nearly three-quarters of a century ago, legislation was signed by President Theodore Roosevelt to create the Bureau of Reclamation. Its mission was to concern itself with the conservation, development and use of the water resources in the arid parts of the West.

In those long-ago years of our beginnings, our mutual problems were vastly different from those of today. In 1900—two years before the Bureau of Reclamation began its work, the District of Columbia had twice as many people as the area we now know as Arizona. California, for all its size and celebrated attractions, was home to fewer than one and a half million people, something under eight per square mile. Other Western states were even more sparsely settled. While most of the West was arid, there was water enough for all if adequate collection and distribution systems could be devised.

In that same year, there were six National Parks, with an annual visitation of about 100,000. With a total population of only 76 million people—most of whom did little traveling beyond the nearby county seat or a summer cottage at the lake—the impact of too many human feet or too many wheels wasn't a serious problem.

You all know how the picture has changed. Today, 200 million people live in the United States, most of them crowded into huge population centers.

Last year, we recorded more than 133 million visits to well over 200 areas of the National Park System.

Last year—and, indeed, for many years before—states, counties, cities, towns and other governmental groups, fought for a share of the West's available water supply.

To put it simply, we have all virtually been overwhelmed by people, by houses, by concrete, by automobiles, by asphalt, by the insatiable demands and pressures fostered by an affluence unequalled in history.

In past years, we could each go our own way, doing our own jobs. Scant attention was paid to a basic truth then acknowledged by only a few far-seeing men: That everything in nature is hitched to something else; that anything we do, sooner or later, affects someone else. Perhaps we could, at one moment in time, afford the luxury of a myopic viewpoint toward the use and management of natural resources. But the world did not stand still, and it never will.

No longer can anyone disregard his neighbor. The pressures are too great—the needs are too urgent.

This is not visionary rhetoric. I know, and you know, that somehow we must learn to meet all of man's needs with the resources that are available to us. This is the ultimate challenge of conservation. Whatever else may intrude upon the national conscience or absorb our time and treasure, this challenge is the major fact of life in 1967.

This does not suggest that we have not been trying to meet the challenge. We have been trying, and I think great progress has been made. Certainly the seeds of cooperation

at all levels have taken firm root, and all of the groups and organizations represented here can take justifiable pride in what has been done. We have proved that we can work together, if there is the will—even though sometimes the will has to be encouraged, and sometimes it takes a while to get it worked up.

Let me cite two instances to make the point.

A controversy plagued us for several years with our sister agency—the Bureau of Reclamation—in the operation of Jackson Lake in Grand Teton National Park, one of the crown jewels in the National Park System. I am sure many of you have visited this park, and been thrilled by the splendor of its chain of peaks mirrored on the waters of Jackson Lake.

However beautiful, this lake is a reservoir, and has been since 1907. Water is stored, and released down the Snake River to maintain storage at Palisades Dam and provide water for irrigation of crops in Idaho.

In earlier years, the water was let out of Jackson Lake during the height of the visitor season. The quality of a park experience was impaired by this drawdown and recreational opportunities downstream on the Snake River were curtailed in late summer. In 1961, the drawdown was 39 feet—not much compared to an average drawdown of around 185 feet at Fontana Lake bordering the Great Smoky Mountains National Park—but 39 feet at Jackson Lake was ruinous for the park.

I'm happy to report that we have resolved most of these problems in our negotiations with the Bureau of Reclamation. The lake level is now maintained during most of the summer season when the park is full of visitors. The release schedule has been adjusted to accommodate our visitors, to provide adequate water in the Snake for its full recreational use, and to maintain the other necessary downstream uses.

I had hoped that a similar accommodation of program needs at Fontana Lake, a TVA multi-purpose project, could be in operation by this date. Unfortunately, we have not had similar success.

Of all the blights that destroy scenic values, few are worse than powerlines. We've had some hard problems on this score. We've solved some and failed to solve some, and some are still unresolved. One recent case at Natchez Trace Parkway is eloquent testimony to interagency cooperation.

Here the TVA planned to locate its 500 KVA Maury-Davidson transmission line along the route proposed for the parkway, near its Nashville terminus. In this location, the powerline would have destroyed the very values we sought to protect.

So we started talking, and this last spring an effective and supportable alternative was found. The line is now under construction and when it is finished, it will not be an eyesore to the people using the parkway.

I wish the powerlines at Estes Park, Colorado, had been located with similar concern for scenic values, but in that day and time, esthetic considerations were not so urgent.

In the October-November issue of *Reclamation News*, which carried the program for this conference, the headline on the lead story is: "Creative Water Management, Reclamation's Future." The subhead is: "In this theme, our Hawaiian Convention stresses sensibility to change and ingenuity in action."

In all our history as a Nation, we have been far too insensitive to the effects of the changes we have inflicted on our resources base and on our landscape. Our ingenious works often have been thrust upon the land without heed of consequences. Too often the dollar signs on the benefits we could see outweighed the intangible values too few of us could understand.

The time has come when the consequences of our acts can no longer be ignored, or



lightly passed over. There must an upsurge in sensitivity for our total environment.

Most of the projects proposed by the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation or the TVA are analyzed in terms of their cost/benefit ratio. Such factors as irrigation benefits, settlement opportunities, economic growth, area redevelopment, flood control, power, fish and wildlife, and recreation values all enter the formula.

The purposes behind these projects are legitimate, and ways must be found to serve them. But we must achieve them without destruction of other values which are just as great, and which serve the whole public.

Dollar signs and numbers and mathematics are cold and hard and exact. We're so used to thinking in these terms that we overlook or ignore the fact that few of life's real values—and I use the word life in its broadest sense—can be tagged with a dollar sign. These are the values no formula I've seen can adequately reflect.

This is true in the Glacier View Dam site on the Flathead River, which we oppose. It is true in the proposal to build another high dam in the Colorado River, which we also oppose. It is true in the Buffalo River Dam project in Arkansas, which we oppose.

What dollar value would you put on the shrines of our history? How would you compute in dollars the true value of Crater Lake or of the swift, clear North Fork of the Flathead River in Glacier National Park?

Of what dollar value is the experience to look into or be in the Grand Canyon, carved through eons of time? How do you measure in dollars the thrill of your five-year-old son catching his first fish from a clear, cool stream? What is the dollar value of saving an endangered species of our earth?

How would you compute the cost/benefit ratio of a wilderness, or of the ecological treasure represented by the proposed Kaula National Park here in Hawaii?

I can't give you a formula, but these values are as real as the yield of an irrigated alfalfa field, or the industry supported by more kilowatt hours of electricity.

As a people, as a society, we have the power to effect massive changes in our environment. Indeed, we have done just that—and often the results testify to our lack of intelligence.

Where are we going from here?

No one knows for certain what our world will be like 50 or 100 years from today. Much will depend upon our personal and national attitudes toward the kind of life we want our descendants to have.

Will we provide a heritage of individual strength, an environment rich in the values most of us have enjoyed in our lifetimes? Or will we leave behind us only the wretched remnants of something that was great?

A substantial body of scientific thought suggests a program of education to limit population. Since man is the greatest predator, polluter, spoiler, and destroyer perhaps there's great validity to that viewpoint. Perhaps we need the "Malthusian belt" Aldous Huxley talked about 35 years ago. Perhaps we need a broader and more specific source of revenue that can be directly used to preserve and protect what is left of our heritage. At the very least we need better tools and more "sensitivity to change and ingenuity in action."

If we don't, there may be little in the future worth worrying about.

#### IN DEFENSE OF THE U.S. CONGRESS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection

to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it has become popular with the press and people in all walks of life to criticize the U.S. Congress when, therefore, one is willing to rise to its defense it comes as a pleasant surprise.

J. Allen Overton, executive vice president of the American Mining Congress, in a speech before the Portland Cement Association convention, delivered an outstanding address in defense of the legislative branch of the Government. His challenge to the convention and to all America to correct the declining prestige of Congress should be read by all Americans.

Mr. Overton's speech follows:

The American Mining Congress is honored by your invitation to share in that portion of the program for this Portland Cement Association convention which involves your Safety Awards and Honors for several very significant reasons.

First, I am especially honored with the privilege of speaking here today before the chief officers of the companies who operate in every one of the 50 States of our Nation and who service every city, town and hamlet in the Nation. Seldom is a person accorded the privilege of visiting with such a distinguished and important element of our Nation's business leadership.

Secondly, I am honored by your invitation to address this Safety Awards Luncheon because the American Mining Congress has for a great many years placed an emphasis on safety which is second to no other undertaking in the mining industry, and by which effort the American Mining Congress became one of the pioneers in the safety efforts of industrial activities.

My third reason for being honored by having the opportunity to speak to you today—and the last one I will specifically state, although there are many others—is because of the long, friendly and close working association which the American Mining Congress has had with the cement industry through a very active and comprehensive membership of your companies. This association has given us a rare insight into your industry's problems and accomplishments. We are abundantly concerned with your problems and we share your pleasure in surveying your many accomplishments.

So we speak the same language, you and I. And we have many, many concerns in common.

You have heard much at these sessions about planning for safety, about accident prevention and the techniques which can bring your goals closer to the reach of every employee and every employer. Surrounded, as I am here today, by some of this Nation's most accomplished experts in these areas, I will not presume on your time by any discussion of the technical aspects in these fields which you know so well.

Your deliberations have involved you, too, in matters related to pollution abatement, an area of prime concern not alone to cement, but also to every other segment of mining, to all enlightened industry—and indeed to every man, woman and child in America. Again, I would not presume to engage in any technical discussion of this subject—except to point out the appropriateness of your consideration in a single session of these two subjects which are in the van of our industry's interest and also occupy a major portion of government considerations today.

Day by day, we in the private enterprise section of our economy are becoming aware of increasing involvement of government in

our affairs. This is true of the subject of pollution controls and of the safety features of industrial activities. No longer are safety in the working place, control of stack emissions, quality of plant water discharges, noises from industrial operations, odors from some types of processing endeavors, and a host of other factors inherent in industrial operations treated as separate items of consideration. They all are bulked together now in Washington in a single designation—"Quality of Our Environment". The development of governmental interest in these fields is not limited to our working hours alone. In a recent report to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, a special study group advocated that Federalism take over the direction and control of all aspects of human life during every waking and sleeping moment.

Such a broad concept of the government's appropriate role in the "new civics"—called "creative Federalism"—may cause additional concern and activity during our every waking moment and perhaps may even eat into a little of our sleep!

So, as we gather here to award Safety Honors, we are active in but a small segment of the total concern of our companies' involvement in a broad field of industry-government relationships.

I have apparently digressed from what might be expected for the topic of a talk at a Safety Awards luncheon. You may by now well wonder what in the world I intend to talk about. Since I have indicated that Safety is now involved in a much broader field than prevention of a cut or bruise in our daily work-a-day world and more comprehensive than any regional application of controls or regulations, I want to devote our attention to the real field of safety in which we are involved today—I wish to discuss with you for a few moments our first safety question—"How safe is America?"

Well, I'm from West Virginia.

In that garden spot of America, we're noted neither for our reticence nor for shortness of breath.

Therefore, true to the traditions of my forebears, when I find myself facing a gracious audience and confronting a live microphone I take advantage of a kindly situation.

I referred a moment ago to the many concerns we have in common. My business, as you know, keeps me pretty much in Washington, D.C. I have been there for many years, deeply involved in the processes of government—and keenly concerned about the growing impact of the governmental processes on virtually all of the business decisions which are made every hour of every day by many millions of Americans.

It is about the legislative process in Washington, with which I have been intimately associated for some 25 years—and more particularly about the dedicated men and women who make it work—that I want to visit with you today.

We are, all of us, much involved, on a personal, a company, an industry basis in virtually every action taken—every decision made—by the Senate of the United States and the United States House of Representatives. We see ourselves affected by legislative proposals in such diverse fields as taxation, foreign policy, military affairs, tariff and trade, appropriations—and the hardy perennials which command the very special attention of our industry, such as mine safety, pollution abatement, and the other items in the long litany.

But I want you to look with me beyond the specifics of these pressing legislative concerns. I want you to assess with me a condition which could well hold within itself the seeds of a development far more important to this Nation than the safety requirements of our daily occupation, more important than the very legislation on which the Congress acts.



I am concerned—very concerned—about the decline in Congressional prestige.

I am concerned—very concerned—that each and every one of us face up to his civic duty to do something about correcting this decline.

I am persuaded beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Congress of the United States is the last best hope of free men and free government. In saying this, I demean no other branch, no other arm, no other facet of our governmental structure. As I indicated a moment ago, I served in State government. Also, it was my great privilege to serve for several years (beginning in the middle 1950s) in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government in Washington. One of my most treasured keepsakes of that service is the framed Commission of Office, indicating appointment by the President and, equally important, confirmation by the Senate. As a lawyer who began his adult working life in the private practice of law, and whose only son is now engaged in the study of law, my respect for our Judicial system is ingrained and deep.

Yet, of all the great branches of our government, the Congress of the United States, as I see it, stands closest to the people, instinctively responsive to their wishes, steadily reflecting their hopes and aspirations.

The Senate of the United States has well been called the world's greatest deliberative body; the House of Representatives aptly labeled the Forge of Democracy. The impact of the Congress, and through it the impact of the people, on the other great branches of government is both obvious and pervasive. Graduates of the House and the Senate have served with high honor and great distinction at all levels of the Judiciary since the earliest days of this Republic. The White House too has been graced by those who first served on the national scene in the Congress of the United States. Indeed, three of the last four Presidents served first in the Congress. So too did the last five men who have served as Vice Presidents of the United States.

Despite all these obvious considerations, we have witnessed throughout most of our adult lifetimes—interrupted only now and then, subsiding only occasionally—a persistent, a relentless effort by the advocates of strong central government to downgrade the prestige of Congress, to tarnish its image before the public. For more years than most of us care to remember, we have seen this steady campaign, listened to the incessant drumfire of its single theme—that we ought somehow to regard Congress (the institution, and all to often the individuals who comprise it) as an assortment of buffoons, and worse.

This is a slander of low degree. It is totally unjustified. And we—every one of us—can and should start doing something about it, and now. This is our safety problem. This is the safety problem of the Republic.

From my many years of close personal association with the legislative process in Washington, I am a complete, a total believer in the skill, the dedication, the reliability of the men and women who serve in the House and the Senate. I don't always agree with what they do, and maybe that's as it should be. But they do reflect the attitudes of the folks at home, and I don't know of a single one among them who isn't ready and willing always to account to the folks at home for his actions and his votes.

But what's happening? What impression is the most prevalent impression about the Congress in the minds of the American voters? Buffoons, and worse, as I said a moment ago.

Now, why is this happening? Congress, unlike the Presidency, is not a highly personalized institution. Congress is impersonal, in great part because of its very size. This unwieldy, impersonal quality makes it easy for advocates of bigger and stronger central government to point an accusing finger at Congress, to lay the blame on Congress for

a wide range of shortcomings which are properly chargeable to somebody else. The composite and grossly inaccurate result, after all these years, is that Congress is characterized before the public as dull, insensitive, an essentially selfish group serving only some narrow "special" interests and caring not a whit for the welfare of the people.

Add to that the few in Congress—and they are very, very few indeed—who have abused the power of their Congressional offices, or used their official positions for personal gain. The vocal critics of this very great institution need only one such case every decade—even the suggestion of a case will do—to reinforce the campaign of slander, abuse and ridicule. And Congress, again because it is so unwieldy and as an institution so impersonal, does not and cannot adequately defend itself.

In all this, who is the loser? Who loses when public confidence in the Congress is slowly eroded and finally undermined?

Everybody loses. Literally everybody. The Congress itself, the public generally, you and I—we all lose. The cause of good government is set back immeasurably.

And if we're going to turn this thing around—we'd better tackle it at the point where we have some likelihood of success.

You—yes, you—you'd better tackle it in the person of your own Congressman. Whether you like his politics, or whether you don't, get better acquainted with him. If you don't like the Congressman you have, maybe you can get another one next year. But you'd better get together now with the one you do have. Let him know your respect for the institution in which he serves. Let him know you don't put him or the Congress in this "buffoons, or worse" category.

The process must begin somewhere if we are ever to let Congress know there are people who understand and appreciate its role and its efforts. Your one Congressman and your two Senators add up to only three of the more than 500 Members in both Houses of Congress. Only three, but they're your three. This is a good place for you to start. Take these three as an assignment for yourself. Invite them to your meetings where you can. Go meet with them where you can. Maybe you can generate some local recognition—newspaper editorials, civic club activities, and the like—as your contribution to the start of a campaign to upgrade the Congress in the public's esteem, to restore it to its rightful position in terms of prestige, public understanding and appreciation of its very great significance.

You can do your part in all this without endorsing the reelection of a Congressman or Senator of whom you don't approve. Get behind your own candidate with all the steam you can generate. If you elect him, you'll obviously feel that much better. Don't apologize for opposing the reelection of an incumbent. Don't apologize for being a hard-working supporter of your own Party and your own candidate. The real genius of our system remains its basic two-Party character.

So, if you generate some public recognition for a Member or a candidate whom you do support, all the better in your view. If you feel that you're saddled with one you cannot support publicly, then let him know quietly and privately that you are not one who thinks Congress is sinking to the low estate its critics ascribe to it.

This will not be an idle gesture on your part. This is a civic obligation that squarely faces every one of us. And, if you're inclined to look for some return beyond your duty to improve the body politic—then I would only add that a prime rule of human behavior tells you that you'll achieve with that Member of Congress a better relationship, a better appreciation of your problems—if you make this effort, regardless of whether you and he agree politically, ideologically, or on a specific issue of the moment.

The time for this is now. Never before in these many years of my exposure to the workings of Congress have Members of the House and Senate seemed more sensitive to their unfortunate—and unfair—public image. Never before in these years have they seemed so much to need, and to welcome, the understanding of their constituents. And I would add that never before in these years have I felt that the Congress—collectively and individually—was as badly maligned and slandered as it is today.

We have many problems in Washington, you and I.

Industry's concerns with the processes of government add up to a big job, a many-sided job. That you know this is obvious. Your presence here, and the enthusiasm and purpose with which you participated in these very constructive sessions in Chicago give ample testimony of your awareness of that fact.

Yes—this activity we like to call Governmental Affairs is indeed a big job, a many-sided job. And I'm convinced that we single out the most important part of the whole undertaking when we say—

It's time to Speak Up.

It's time to Stem the Slanders.

It's time to let the House and the Senate know there are some who Salute its Integrity—who would Restore its Prestige—who would Proclaim Again free government's essential dependence on the Congress of the United States—who realize this is the first Safety Program of our industry—and who realize that America is only as safe as its Congress is strong and respected.

#### HIS ALIBI TRUE, KILLING SUSPECT FREED AFTER YEAR

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked by the action of the House the other day, on the poverty bill, to the effect that a man accused of a certain type of illegal act is entitled to legal counsel only if he can afford to pay for it.

In these days there seems to be a tendency to forget our basic constitutional principle that a man is considered innocent until proven guilty.

It is well to remember that many an accused has been shown to be innocent in spite of a strong apparent case against him. A dramatic example of this was reported in the New York Times this morning. A Bronx man was accused and held for a year on a murder charge. The case against him seemed strong, but two court-appointed lawyers went diligently to work and proved his innocence.

The story follows:

HIS ALIBI TRUE, KILLING SUSPECT FREED AFTER YEAR—BRONX MAN PROVES HE WAS IN MASSACHUSETTS AT TIME OF HOLDUP SHOOTING HERE

(By Sylvan Fox)

Devoted efforts by two court-appointed lawyers won freedom yesterday for a 22-year-old former police trainee who had spent more than a year in jail awaiting trial for a murder that he could not have committed.

When the young man, William Chisolm, walked out of Bronx Supreme Court, it was the end of a nightmare that had begun in October, 1966, with his arrest for the holdup shooting of a Bronx furniture store owner.



The nightmare had the trappings of justice: arrest, identification by two witnesses, extradition, incarceration without bail, indictment for first-degree murder.

But Mr. Chisolm's court-appointed Bronx lawyer, Archie Gorfinkel, and an unpaid lawyer from Newport, R.I., Matthew Faerber, were convinced that justice was not being done. They believed Mr. Chisolm was not guilty and decided to prove it.

Mr. Gorfinkel, a 40-year-old former Bronx assistant district attorney and former State Senator, tell the story this way:

On Aug. 24, 1966, José Carrion was shot and killed during a holdup in his furniture store at East 162d Street and Third Avenue. Two women caught a fleeting glimpse of the two bandits who fled.

The women provided the police with descriptions of the killers, and an investigation led detectives to Hershey Boyer, 24 years old, of 1035 Freeman Street, the Bronx. Mr. Boyer and Mr. Chisolm, who are cousins, lived in the same building. Mr. Chisolm had vanished from his apartment and his usual haunts. The police sent out an alarm for him.

Two months later Mr. Chisolm was traced to the home of his mother, Mrs. Ann Williams of 101 Jones Street, Middletown, R.I. He was arrested and charged with the murder of Mr. Carrion.

#### EXTRADITED AS SUSPECT

At an extradition hearing in Rhode Island, the two witnesses identified Mr. Chisolm as one of the bandits they had seen leaving the furniture store. Mr. Chisolm was extradited to the Bronx, held without bail and indicted, along with Mr. Boyer, for first-degree murder.

During the extradition proceedings, Mr. Chisolm told his Rhode Island lawyer, Mr. Faerber, that he had gone to Middletown the day before the shooting, because his stepbrother had died, and thus could not have been involved in the Bronx murder.

Mr. Faerber found 10 witnesses who could verify this. He also found a receipt from a Fall River, Mass., department store, signed by Mr. Chisolm on the day of the shooting, for the return of a suit bought for his dead stepbrother.

In April, when Mr. Gorfinkel became Mr. Chisolm's lawyer, he joined in the campaign to prove the young man not guilty.

"When I first spoke to Chisolm," Mr. Gorfinkel said, "you know, you get cynical in this business, but he appealed to me when he told me his story. I believed him. From there on, I went all the way."

Mr. Gorfinkel rounded up the 10 witnesses found by Mr. Faerber—and 10 more who could swear Mr. Chisolm was in Rhode Island at the time of the shooting.

Armed with the names of witnesses and the department-store receipt, Mr. Gorfinkel went to the Bronx District Attorney's office, "and told them what I had and I requested that they reopen the investigation—which they did."

In the new inquiry, a Police Department handwriting expert confirmed that the Fall River department store receipt had been signed by Mr. Chisolm.

Yesterday Assistant District Attorney Irvin Goldsmith told Supreme Court Justice Arthur Markewich he would agree to dismissal of the murder indictment against Mr. Chisolm as soon as routine paperwork was completed. Mr. Chisolm was released on parole and will be formally discharged from custody on Nov. 22.

Mr. Boyer remains in jail, awaiting trial for the Carrion murder.

#### KING WARNS OF RIOTS IF AID MEETS DELAY

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on October 4 of this year I discussed extensively the subject of civil disobedience and nonviolence as propounded by Dr. Martin Luther King. This issue and its interpretation by Dr. King are of considerable interest, judging from the hundreds of requests I have received for this material. A recent article in the Cleveland Plain Dealer indicates that King's program of massive nonviolence is to be carried forth more earnestly. According to the article by Joseph Eszterhas, King planned a 2-week retreat to plan ways to prod Congress and the Federal Government into action.

King was quoted as saying that a "cadre of 200 hard-core disrupters will be trained in the tactics of massive nonviolence." These "disrupters" will then go back to their cities and train other units. The object of this project is to hold a "nationwide city-paralyzing demonstration" centered in Washington but extending to 10 other cities.

I place the article, "King Warns of Riots if Aid Meets Delay," in the RECORD at this point:

#### KING WARNS OF RIOTS IF AID MEETS DELAY

(By Joseph Eszterhas)

The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. warned yesterday of "massive winter riots in Cleveland, in Gary, or in any other ghetto" unless the business communities and federal government come to the immediate aid of the nation's poor.

"I want you to understand," King said, "I am not in favor of these riots. I will do everything in my power to help avert them. But, as a social analyst, I must speak honestly."

Unless immediate aid is given to the ghettos, he said, Mayors-elect Carl B. Stokes and Richard D. Hatcher will be only "two outstanding men we have set up as lambs for the slaughter."

King spoke to newsmen at the Fellowship Baptist Church of Christ, 1754 E. 55 Street, on what he called a "day of sober celebration."

King, Nobel Prize winner and president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, has been in Cleveland frequently since early summer furthering "Operation Breadbasket" and other antipoverty programs.

He said he was "very tired but very pleased about the dual victories of creative black power in Cleveland and Gary."

The election of Stokes and Hatcher, he said, represents a "new political fervor among America's Negro citizens."

He called this a "desperate quest to find someone to champion the cause of the poor and oppressed in our cities."

Neither Stokes nor Hatcher can "do it alone," he said. "They need federal aid against poverty. To cut the poverty program would border on criminal irresponsibility and would be an open invitation to violence and social disorder in the streets of our ghettos."

"Carl Stokes may have friends in Washington," he said, "but friends alone are not enough. He needs a strong poverty program and the support of Congress."

King said his next step would be a "two-week retreat in which he will plan out ways to prod Congress and the federal government into action."

"We will, if we have to, engage in massive

nonviolence which will probably include acts of civil disobedience."

Strategically, he said, a "cadre of 200 hard-core disrupters will be trained in the tactics of massive nonviolence." These "disrupters" will then go back to their cities and train other units.

The object, he explained, is to hold a "nationwide city-paralyzing demonstration" centered in Washington but including simultaneous demonstrations in 10 other cities.

He said the cities had not yet been determined but added: "I would not rule Cleveland out."

"We have to find the middle ground between riots and timid supplication and we have to develop the moral determination to move down that road if we have to."

#### THE DAYTON JOURNAL HERALD URGES CHANGING THE ANTIPOVERTY BILL TO REMOVE PUBLIC OFFICIALS FROM COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHALEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to put before the House the editorial comments of the Journal Herald, of Dayton, Ohio, a distinguished newspaper in my district, regarding the change enacted concerning provisions of the community action program portion of the antipoverty bill.

In the editorial, Mr. Glenn Thompson, the highly respected editor of the Journal Herald, characterizes as a mistake the provision that gives control of community action programs to local governments.

I agree with Mr. Thompson's observations. I would point out also that he knows whereof he speaks: He is a member of the board of directors of our area's community action program agency, the Supporting Council on Preventive Effort—SCOPE.

I therefore invite the attention of my colleagues to this editorial, which appeared in yesterday's editions and which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

#### HANDS OFF POVERTY WAR

The House of Representatives in Washington made a mistake when it wrote into its war-on-poverty bill a provision that city halls or county courthouses might run, or name the agency to run, much of the war at the local level. The Senate ought to correct this.

The part of the war which is involved is the community action program. This is the part which SCOPE, with headquarters in Dayton, runs for six Miami Valley counties.

To split this up among the counties would result in a great loss of effectiveness and, almost certainly, abandonment of the program in some areas.

In many cities elsewhere, if the program were turned over to city hall, it would almost certainly be used for political patronage immediately.

The war on poverty has many things wrong with it. For one thing, its army was thrown together in haste and is held together with difficulty, especially when Congress is so whimsical and unreliable in providing the money.



There is room for a great deal more planning than now goes into the program. It needs closer scrutiny of its spending. It desperately needs realistic appraisal of the results obtained by its projects. Never has so much money been spent with so little serious inquiry into whether the dollars accomplished their purposes.

All in all, however, the war on poverty is doing good. A great deal of good. A good deal of competence also has been assembled in its organization at levels reaching from grass roots to Washington. This organization, of course, could be improved. But not by turning it over to local governments.

#### NORTH-CENTRAL FREEWAY

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GUDE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, reports of imminent decisions by the Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd relative to Washington area transportation matters are of increasing concern to local and State governments of Greater Washington. Both planning and operational agencies of Maryland and Virginia jurisdictions have emphasized the need to implement and follow through on the longstanding plans by which the entire area can enjoy a true, balanced transportation system, and prevent the chaos resulting from continued delays and the total negation of constructive planning that this area has been experiencing.

I continue to work for the development of an effective transportation plan in the interest of all the citizens of our metropolitan area. I hope that my colleagues will note the manner in which the administration through the Department of Transportation is performing in these matters. I wish to call to the attention of the Members the following resolution of the Montgomery County, Md., Council:

#### RESOLUTION NO. 6-847: ENDORSEMENT OF NORTH-CENTRAL FREEWAY

Whereas, the North-Central Freeway has been shown as part of the Basic Freeway Plan (Part I) of the Mass Transportation Survey for the National Capital Region, which plan was approved by the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council on November 7, 1958; and

Whereas, A report to the President of the United States for transmittal to Congress by the National Capital Transportation Agency entitled "Recommendations for Transportation in the National Capital Region" dated November 1, 1962, endorsed the North-Central Freeway; and

Whereas, the need for the North-Central Freeway has been indicated in the Master Plan of Takoma Park-Langley Park Planning Area adopted by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, October, 1963, and the Preliminary Master Plan of Highways for the Metropolitan Washington Regional District in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, published April 1967; and

Whereas, basic land use decisions for the rapidly growing Silver Spring Business District cannot proceed until there is a clear cut decision regarding the future of the North-Central Freeway; and

Whereas, the North-Central Freeway desired line is shown on the General Plan for the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, entitled "... on wedges and corridors ...", prepared and adopted by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on January 22, 1964; and

Whereas, the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic and the Maryland State Roads Commission, together sponsored and engaged the J. E. Greiner Company to perform an Engineering Feasibility Report for the North-Central Freeway within the District of Columbia and the Maryland Counties of Montgomery and Prince George's which was published October, 1964, at the cost of \$350,000 resulting in the concept of the low level freeway, which proposal was recommended by the Maryland State Roads Commission to the Bureau of Public Roads; and

Whereas, the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic sponsored and engaged the firms of Alan M. Voorhees and Associates and Wilbur Smith and Associates to prepare a study entitled "Traffic Planning for the North-Central Freeway" which was published April, 1966, at a cost of \$64,200; and

Whereas, as a result of public reactions to the October, 1964, Greiner Report, the J. E. Greiner Company was again engaged to do a Supplementary Engineering Feasibility Report for the North-Central Freeway, which study was published November, 1966, at a cost of \$115,700; and

Whereas, current planning and development within the urbanized southern portion of Montgomery County will be greatly affected by the deletion of the North-Central Freeway;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Montgomery County Council has previously supported and continues to support a balanced transportation system involving both highways and rapid rail transit, and

Be it further resolved that the Montgomery County Council endorses the need for the North-Central Freeway as planned and urges the Secretary and the Department of Transportation to reconsider any proposal which may delete the North-Central Freeway from the Interstate Highway System for the National Capital Area.

#### DUTIES OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORTING MUSIC AND THE THEATER IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues who are concerned with the operation of the arts and humanities program will be interested in the recent talk by President Herman D. Kenin, of the American Federation of Musicians, on the the subject of "Duties of Public Authorities in Supporting Music and the Theater in the United States."

This talk was given at the International Secretariat of Entertainment Trade Unions in London, England, and demonstrates that the trade unions of the world look to the United States for information in this field.

I am pleased that Abe L. Savage, the new director of public relations for the

American Federation of Musicians, brought this to my attention, and I, in turn, bring it to my colleagues:

#### DUTIES OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORTING MUSIC AND THE THEATER IN THE UNITED STATES

(Remarks by Herman D. Kenin, president, American Federation of Musicians, at International Secretariat of Entertainment Trade Unions, London, England, September 28, 1967)

In his gracious invitation to me to address the International Congress, Alan Forrest included his excellent notes on the discussion of the same topic, which took place at the European meeting last November. It is my assignment to fill you in with similar information regarding the United States.

In his letter Alan remarked, "United States intervention in this field is, I believe, a new phenomenon."

This is quite true. But, I must add that if public intervention in the performing arts is comparatively new with us, so too is the business of our becoming a Nation.

It is barely one hundred years since our last frontier disappeared in America, and we finally began to put down economic roots from coast to coast. This might be borne in mind in making any assessment of public involvement in this particular area, as between your countries and mine. In other words, although man does not live by bread alone—and come to think of it—it would be calamitous for this particular audience if he did—he must start with the bread, before he can go on to "higher things". First comes the staff of life; the musical staff follows.

But if we in the United States are slow starters, we try to make up ground fast. Fortunately, one area in which we have been coming on is in the performing arts.

Let me illustrate by pointing to some fairly recent events. In September, 1961, a small group of Congressmen, headed by the indefatigable and dedicated Frank Thompson, Jr. of New Jersey, was carefully guiding through the House of Representatives an innocuous little bill which provided for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council of the Arts.

The bill, I might add, carried with it no money appropriations or grants—with the exception of \$100,000 per year for administration. Not a word about subsidies. Indeed the supporters of the measure bent over backwards to assure their colleagues, during the House discussion, that the bill had no such purpose or intent.

In the words of one speaker, "This is what you might call a status bill. What it does is to give status and recognition to the importance of culture in the United States."

As I recall, the overall mood of the House ranged from uninterest to apathy—with the exception of a few congressmen who were overtly hostile.

One of this last group took the floor to point out that in certain quarters poker playing was considered an artful occupation. He asked, "Is this going to subsidize poker players that get in trouble?" He was placatingly assured that it would not include poker playing.

Now let me give you another date—August 24, 1967—and quote from a long news story in the New York Times. The lead sentence of the story reads:

"The National Council on the Arts has recommended that Congress appropriate \$139,000,000 next year to support the most extensive Federal Arts Program in the Nation's history."

This total was broken down, in the bill, as follows:

"Theater, \$30-million; music, \$33-million; radio, television and motion pictures, \$22-million; visual arts, \$20-million; dance, \$14.5-million; architecture and design, \$10-million, and state arts groups, \$5.5-million."



In all candor, I must report to you that the chances for enactment by Congress of the total recommendation are slim. In America we are facing problems, at home and abroad, which will probably call for unprecedented Federal expenditures. Realistically, then, we must assume that there will be some sharp pruning of the initial figures.

Even so, to me the most encouraging aspect of this proposal is that it is *being made*, despite the heavy financial burdens and commitments my country has elsewhere. The very fact that the proponents of subsidies for the Performing Arts can present such proposals in these times and be assured of serious Congressional consideration for them is as significant as the size of the amounts requested.

Thus, we have in the brief span of six years experienced a tremendous, almost unbelievable change in public climate for the performing arts. I think that an examination of the factors which have brought about this monumental change will help bring into proper focus the position of the United States today with regard to public intervention, responsibility and support in the broad area of the performing arts—particularly in music and the theater.

There have been two discernible trends. One is the mounting popular enthusiasm for the arts; second, there is a growing concern on the part of the Government for the state of the arts.

In both of these fields, I am happy to report, organized labor has taken a consistently purposeful role. What trade unions did was to create the economic well-being whereby the arts in America could attain a broad democratic base.

It was Walt Whitman, I believe, who said that to have great poets we must have great audiences too. Organized labor has provided that audience. Through its successful efforts to improve the material aspects of its members' lives, it has concurrently created new opportunities and higher aspirations for the more spiritual things of life as well.

As all of us here know all too well, these goals were not always easy of attainment. Too many times, indeed, they came with glacial slowness, and with great personal sacrifice. To put it another way—in many instances picket lines had to precede ticket lines.

I know that for an audience of this type I am laboring the obvious when I go into the contributions of organized labor toward the development of the performing arts. However, there are other audiences who do need an occasional reminder. This is especially true today when culture, in its many manifestations, has become the object of interest for groups and organizations who are not nearly as familiar with the accomplishments of organized labor as are you and I.

There are other areas too in which, by direct action, organized labor has helped spur and stimulate governmental attention to the performing arts.

My own organization, for example, has for a number of years been in the forefront of grass-roots political activity. Through more than 600 of our locals in the United States, we informed—and continue to inform—our representatives in Congress of our special interest in the expansion of the performing arts. In this activity we have received the enthusiasm and able cooperation of our other American entertainment unions.

Another recent and noteworthy development in the United States is the emergence of State Councils on the Arts. In 1960 there were none. Today there is one in each of our 50 states, as well as in the District Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The record of accomplishment among these State groups varies greatly. A few, like the New York State Council on the Arts, are undertaking impressive programs to encour-

age and develop music, the theater and the dance. It is generally agreed that these bodies are already beginning to have a real impact on cultural activities and growing cultural awareness throughout the state. Others, however, are still in the formative stage, and are just beginning to acquire minimal budgets and experienced administrative personnel.

For the most part, this is also true of the city and county arts councils which have begun to proliferate in America. Today, we have more than 400 of these, the majority having been organized or established in the last three or four years. Although it is entirely too early to make any sort of evaluation, there is no question but that their potential is great, and that within the next few years these local groups may yet emerge as one of the potent forces in American grass-roots involvement with the performing arts.

In this very connection I want to report a project which will be soon undertaken in the United States, to explore the possibility of developing cultural programs in the community, by collaboration of trade unions and local arts councils.

This project stems from the appointment at the 1965 AFL-CIO Convention of a subcommittee, consisting of President George Meany and myself, which was directed to study ways and means by which the AFL-CIO can assume "responsibility toward the goal of true involvement of labor in the cultural life of these United States."

As a result of this assignment, Mr. Meany and myself, on September 11th of this year, recommended to the AFL-CIO Executive Council a program for these goals.

I am happy to report that it was accepted by the Executive Council. The subcommittee recommendations were briefly, as follows:

1. That all AFL-CIO affiliates and members be urged to participate more actively in the policy making voice and Committees of Community Councils and Commissions.
2. That the AFL-CIO, through its staff and departments, develop pilot projects through central labor bodies in three communities (preferably, Louisville, Minneapolis and Buffalo) and one major production center, preferably New York City.
3. That the AFL-CIO staff develop relationships with area councils on all levels for the purpose of presentation to the public of specific performing arts produced on the local level.

Our recommendations to the Executive Council also provided that President Meany be authorized to expend a sum of up to \$10,000 for the six months of the project's operation.

National Foundation Chairman for the Arts Roger L. Stevens has also assured us of his sympathetic consideration for the funding of three or four local pilot projects on a matching basis.

I believe that this program, even on its limited experimental basis, can mark a promising and exciting partnership between organized labor and the public leaders of the cultural life of the community.

Another area which deserves much more attention than I can give it here is the growing participation of American business and industry in the performing arts. I can literally fill pages with a mere enumeration of specific contributions which have been made to music and the theater by so called "Big Business".

Of course—I hasten to add—I shall not.

Instead, I should like to quote from the remarks of the president of one of New York's largest department stores, at a conference on *Business and the Arts* which took place there about a year ago.

He said:

"Society—and business—are both coming of age. Fifty years ago, a conference like this would not only have been most unlikely; we would have been hooted at as either a bunch

of soft headed—do-gooders or a batch of sissies." "The answer for the retail industry is very simple and direct. Stores must reflect the developments, the interests, and yes—the dreams of their communities. Today, frankly, they are not dreaming of a chicken in every pot. Most of them have that.

"Instead they are dreaming of a community arts center, a community orchestra, a community theater—a place or places where they and their children can enjoy their new leisure creatively, intellectually, in the most civilized manner known to man—cultivating the arts and, of course, themselves . . . The catchword here is not more—but better, the spiritual if I may call it that, rather than the material."

There are a number of other causative factors and emerging conditions which are part of the picture I have tried to present to you, but I do not want to impose too much upon either your time or your patience. I am in complete agreement with that great orator who, when once complimented on the quality and brevity of his speeches, replied that he had discovered "in order to be immortal you need not be eternal."

Nevertheless, I must insert a word or two regarding the tremendous benefactions of our numerous foundations, funds, and endowments which have been forthcoming, in ever increasing numbers—and at the same time to express the appreciation of both the performer and the audiences for the benefits created by them.

I must add a sentence or two on the tremendous worth and great excitement which have been generated for millions of youngsters in the public schools of America by the demonstrations of the living arts which are being arranged in public schools by grants from the Office of Education, which is one of the constituents of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I shall conclude by touching, for a moment or two, on what I consider to be two of the most important factors of all—in this democratic atmosphere in which my country's performing arts are beginning to flourish today.

The first one springs from a change in the United States in the semantics of a single word.

That word is "subsidy".

In the United States you can no longer frighten the public, or intimidate legislators, by denouncing subsidies for the arts as socialistic, or communistic. Sneers at the effete and "bohemian" lives of the artistic fraternity fall on deaf ears. Raising the bugaboo of federal control or domination of the Performing Arts produces no apprehensions.

That same legislator, who in 1961 wanted to know whether poker playing would be classified as a performing art, was guilty of nothing more than a heavy-handed attempt at humor.

If he were to make the same query today, however, he would be guilty of poor politics—and that, for a politician, is unforgivable.

After all we Americans have not only known the word "subsidy", but have accepted it for many years as an economic fact of life.

Now we have gone a step further, and have broadened the definition to include the various ingredients of our national culture.

This is one great advance.

The other is of equally transcendent importance.

It stems from the fact that the winds of change are blowing throughout our land. The changes are far ranging. Their eventual effects can only be guessed at. But even today some of the outlines are emerging.

We can take it for granted that culture in America is no longer caviar to the general. It is no longer the pet of the few. It has been taken over and now belongs to the masses, in the true sense of that word.

And make no mistake. The taking over has not been a passing whim or fad. It is



total and complete by those who are receiving from it an enrichment of spirit and broadened esthetic horizons. These they now consider as essential to their daily life as food and drink.

To the extent that the people themselves can contribute to the availability and growth of these new valuables they will do so. To the extent that they cannot, they are turning to their legislators and public officials to make up the deficit.

Furthermore, they do not do this with hat in hand. They ask for it as a right—a right which has been conceded to them by their Government—just as that same Government has previously conceded their right to similar assistance in providing for other needs. And their public officials are beginning to respond.

For, let it be said of our legislators that if they are slow to innovate, they are quick to emulate. I do not say this in any disparaging sense. On the contrary, it is to their credit that they hasten to borrow, and to adapt to our own needs, progressive ideas regardless of source. And we are happy that this reception extends to these areas in which we are particularly involved.

"There is a tide in the affairs of men," Shakespeare wrote, "which taken at the flood leads on to fortune." I imagine he was referring to materialistic things, but I think the same concept might be applied elsewhere. I may be unduly optimistic, but I think I see that tide rising for the Performing Arts in America. I believe that we are not too far away from tremendously exciting cultural accomplishments.

Let me close with one final quotation from our late and beloved President Kennedy: "... the encouragement of art is political in the most profound sense, not as a weapon in a struggle, but as an instrument of understanding the futility of struggle between those who share man's faith.

"Aeschylus and Plato are remembered today long after the triumphs of Imperial Athens are gone. Dante outlived the ambitions of thirteenth century Florence. Goethe stands serenely above the politics of Germany, and I am certain that after the dust of centuries has passed over our cities, we, too, will be remembered not for victories or defeats in battle or politics, but for our contribution to the human spirit."

It is a great privilege for me and my Union, as it is for all the other American entertaining Unions represented here today, to be in the center of the activity to which President Kennedy referred, and for each, in our own way, to help create the type of American civilization he envisaged.

#### DIRECT MAIL OPINION POLL ON AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues what may be the most ridiculous scheme ever concocted by a supposedly responsible agency of the Federal Government. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Bureau of Family Services is conducting a direct mail opinion poll on the aid for dependent children program, one feature of which is a bounty of \$2 paid to each welfare mother who com-

pletes and returns HEW's questionnaire within a specified time limit.

According to the information that I have, HEW officials feel that—

An AFDC recipient will more readily answer questions sent by mail for a special study when she is furnished a pencil (sent along with the questionnaire), when she is offered a small sum of money which will not affect the amount of her welfare check, and when she is aware that her replies will not be seen by persons involved in her contacts with the local welfare agency.

How nice it would be if such careful attention was paid to the feelings of the ordinary American taxpayer. Can you imagine the IRS sending out pencils and money to encourage full participation on April 15?

How in the world do you justify using tax money to pay an individual for furnishing information to a tax-supported agency from which she receives her livelihood? I have written to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for an explanation. I hope his answer will satisfy the taxpayers of this country who are even now being asked to kick in an extra 10 percent of their hard-earned dollars to help finance such essential Government operations.

#### VETERANS DAY

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply disturbed this morning, as were many of you, to read a touching letter in the Washington Post from the widow of the late Gen. George S. Patton, recounting her recent difficulty in attempting to purchase a flag for display on Veterans Day.

There will no doubt be a loud outcry in the newspaper from merchants who actually had flags available for public sale. The fact remains that Mrs. Patton did encounter real difficulty when she sought to display a new flag on a holiday which should make us proud of our heritage and should inspire new dedication to our Nation as we remember the millions of Americans who have served so that we might retain our freedom.

I have attempted to contact Mrs. Patton today in order to make certain that she has been able to obtain a new flag subsequent to her unsuccessful effort prior to November 11. It is my understanding that she is out of the city, but I would like to let this charming lady know that we in the Congress still revere our flag and make it available whenever possible. I am requesting that a flag be flown over the Capitol for Mrs. Patton, although I realize that there is the possibility that several of my colleagues will take similar action. If that is the case, I will donate the flag in her behalf to one of the many dedicated veterans' groups in my district in the name of the late general and his still very patriotic wife.

For those of you who did not happen to read the letter in this morning's paper, I ask that it be included at this point in the Record for your edification. I must say that I agree completely with the proposal put forth by Mrs. Patton.

The letter from today's Washington Post follows:

#### VETERANS DAY

As a member of a large military family whose participation over the years in each of this country's wars has made it acutely appreciative of the significance of Nov. 11, as both Armistice and Veterans' Day, I am disheartened to find that apparently some of our local merchants do not consider that significance worth observing. Today, as an example, I sought replacement for a worn flag, hoping to join many of our civilian neighbors in flying one from our house to mark the special occasion.

After having been told by two hardware merchants that they hadn't been stocking them for some time, I went to the central branch of one of the Nation's largest chain department stores, where I had previously seen a flag display. This time the area was filled with Christmas decorations and I was told by the department salesman that all the flags had been put away in the warehouse until after Christmas. Surrounding us were placards announcing that the store was engaging in a "Veteran's Day Sale," but the merchandise was hardly patriotic.

Perhaps it is time that *The Washington Post* considered emulating another major newspaper in this country which regularly marks each national holiday by printing a small replica of the *Stars and Stripes* on its front page with the reminder to its readers to "Fly your flag today!" Possibly with your influence our merchants might once again find that patriotism could also be profitable, as more of our fellow citizens came to recognize that it is neither hawkish nor dovish, but an appropriate declaration of our Americanism to display our country's colors on days of significance to our Nation.

Mrs. GEORGE S. PATTON.

WASHINGTON.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very distressed at the reaction of the OEO to the charge that the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag has been banned from OEO programs, which has the effect of branding several responsible citizens of the First District of Tennessee as liars.

While a personal attack on me by the OEO is of no significance, I will not let OEO cast aspersions on the people of the First District, and I am not going to sit idly by until I know that the Pledge of Allegiance is being carried out in every OEO program throughout the United States.

The denial and falsehood label from the public information director of the OEO in Washington is just another indication of what comes out of Sargent Shriver's propaganda machine, which has been grinding out distortions and falsehoods since he went with the program.

It was one of Sargent Shriver's underlings who first denied that OEO workers



were participating in the demonstrations throughout the country.

It was also one of Sargent Shriver's underlings who first denied that OEO workers were taking part in the riots that destroyed parts of many of our major cities.

And it was one of Sargent Shriver's underlings who first denied that any subversive activities were being carried out in any of the OEO programs.

I could go on and on about Sargent Shriver's propaganda machine turning out material favorable to whatever question is directed to the agency.

The mode of operation of the OEO since it was founded and put under the direction of Sargent Shriver has been first to deny any unfavorable criticism and then to ascertain the facts.

The people of our area are familiar with the handling of the Nashville, Tenn., "hate school" and the Appalachian Volunteers, Inc., headquartered in Bristol, Tenn., in which militant action and subversive activities were carried out.

I wired Sargent Shriver months ago for a complete report on the Appalachian Volunteers, and to date he has not replied. He deals highhandedly with the Members of the Congress as if he were a dictator.

I took the floor of the House to pass on to the Members the allegation made in my district by responsible citizens. I asked for a direct and personal reply from Sargent Shriver himself. To date, only an underling has responded.

There is no doubt in anyone's mind that Sargent Shriver runs a wasteful, badly administered operation. This has been evident since the program started.

I challenged Mr. Shriver on the floor of the House to either confirm or deny the report that the Pledge of Allegiance had been banned, but his propaganda machine quotes a directive dated August 21, 1967. What happened from the time the program started up until that time?

As I said, I am not going to sit idly by until I am convinced that there is no prohibition in any of his programs on reciting the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag anywhere in the United States. Neither am I going to sit idly by until the waste and bad administration have been corrected in his Office. He should be fired now without any further delay.

#### MARINE CORPS BIRTHDAY BALL CEREMONY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress information about the Marine Corps 192d birthday ball ceremony conducted by the Marine Air Reserve Training Detachment, U.S.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Mass. It was my privilege to be a guest at the festivities that started at the Weymouth Naval Air Station and were later concluded at a beautiful setting at the Dreamworld Inn at Scituate, Mass.

Personnel participating in the Marine Corps birthday ball ceremony were:

Col. Christopher M. Canan, commanding officer.

Maj. Pasquale J. Florio, pageant director.

Escorts were: Lt. Col. Albert N. Allen, executive officer; Maj. Clarence E. Jenkins, adjutant; Maj. Arthur R. Anderson, Jr., operations officer; Maj. Frederick J. Cameron, assistant operations officer; and 1st Lt. Roger A. MacIntosh, air control officer.

Also, M. Sgt. Everett W. Emmons, Jr., Gy. Sgt. Robert J. Barlow, S. Sgt. Donald L. Doby, Sgt. Donald J. Baumann, Cpl. Fred J. Baldock, and L. Cpl. Michael L. Copeland.

Color guard: Sgt. Jack W. T. Sterling, Sgt. James J. Martens, Cpl. James D. Coleman, and Cpl. Dannie L. Brown.

Cake escorts: Cpl. Charles R. Cooker, Jr., and Cpl. Milen T. Edris.

Birthday messages: Sgt. Maj. Bernardino R. Stabile and 1st Sgt. Charles J. Garland.

Manquins: Cpl. Glenn A. Gundy and Cpl. Abel J. Cirillo.

Tape: Gy. Sgt. Neal L. Smith.

Lights: Gy. Sgt. Eugene J. Nebelung. Oldest marine: M. Sgt. David L. Schnell.

Youngest marine: L. Cpl. Kenneth G. Sehavilim.

The history of the U.S. Marine Corps was reenacted in one of the most impressive ceremonies I have ever witnessed. I include the entire program as it was arranged:

#### MARINE CORPS BIRTHDAY BALL

House lights.

Music: Sound, general call.

ANNOUNCER. Marines, guests, and other ladies are requested to clear the floor. The ceremony will begin in 5 minutes.

Music: Music sounds Assembly Attention.

ANNOUNCER. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the Marine Corps Ball. The ceremony will begin in 3 minutes and is divided into two parts. First, we will present a pageant recalling past Marine Corps birthdays, and then, the official cake cutting ceremony. It is requested that everyone remain seated during the pageant. Should it be impossible for those in the outer room to see, you may move to the main ballroom and stand against the wall.

(In 1 minute the house lights dim. Music plays. Adjutant walks on. Spotlight on Adjutant. Adjutant commands.)

ADJUTANT. Sound Adjutant's Call.

(Music plays Adjutants call. Spotlight off. Adjutant remains in place.)

ANNOUNCER. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the 192nd anniversary celebration of the United States Marine Corps. We join marines all over the world tonight in commemorating 192 years in which marines have given meaning to our motto "Semper Parati". Tonight, let us recall for you, some previous Marine Corps birthdays, on which men of our Corps, contributed to the traditions, which we now so proudly hail.

(Spotlight on Adjutant. Adjutant commands "Let the pageant begin.")

(Spotlight off Adjutant. Adjutant walks

off floor. Music plays "American the Beautiful.")

ANNOUNCER. Nearly two hundred years ago, a small group of inspired and dedicated colonial Americans, planted the ideas of independence and freedom, in the new world. These ideas fired the imaginations of the Thirteen American Colonies, and took firm root in the hearts of courageous pioneers.

Freedom survives in these great United States today only because each generation of Americans has fulfilled its obligation, inherited from our forefathers, to protect it against the forces of tyranny. That tradition is nowhere better illustrated than in the intertwined history of the Marine Corps. It, like these United States, began modestly nearly two centuries ago.

(1775 figure moves to floor. Spotlight on. Music plays "Yankee Doodle.")

ANNOUNCER. November 10, 1775. The oppressive measures adopted by King George III and his Parliament, angered the American colonists, and led to open warfare in 1775. Thousands of poorly equipped, but courageous "minutemen" gathered to fight the British.

It was during this time that the Continental Congress met and resolved, to form two battalions of Marines, for the defense of the United Colonies. All hail the birth of our corps. (Pause.) At its birth a spirit was evident in this Marine Corps, which has grown through the years. Even as Captain Samuel Nicholas began the building of the Corps, at historic Tun Tavern, in Philadelphia, this spirit foreshadowed the creation of what was to become our Nation's force-in-readiness. Within months they were sailing to their first battle.

On March the third 1776, Captain Nicholas led 300 Marines, as they stormed ashore, in the first amphibious assault in our Nation's history—the raid on New Providence Island. Marines crossed the Delaware with Washington. Marines were at the battles of Trenton and Princeton. On July 4, 1776, the Second Continental Congress presented to the world a Declaration of Independence, that to this day is known as one of the great compositions of history.

(Spotlight off figure. Remove figure from floor. Bring 1812 figure on floor. Music plays "President's March.")

ANNOUNCER. November 10, 1812. The new Nation began to grow, and so did the corps. They learned that freedom must continually be defended.

Lt. Presley O'Bannon led a small group of Marines across the African desert, and captured Derne, Tripoli. For the first time in history, the American flag was flying over a fortress in the old world. In the war of 1812, Marines fought alongside Andrew Jackson down in New Orleans. Marines were aboard the *Chesapeake*, holding a British boarding party at bay, while Lawrence, mortally wounded, murmured "Don't give up the ship". . . . and at Bladensburg, a Marine battalion stopped 15 times their number. Yes, from this time on, there will be few years, when we don't find Marines fighting, in some corner of the world.

(Spotlight off figure. Remove figure from floor. Bring 1840 figure on floor. Spotlight on. Music plays "She Wore a Yellow Ribbon.")

ANNOUNCER. November 10, the 1840's. In the pest hole of Vera Cruz, on the slopes before Chapultepec, in the arid deserts of California, Marines were victorious. At Mexico City, the first U.S. troops to enter the city were Marines, led by the indestructible Captain Terrett. It was Lt. Nicholson, of the corps, who first raised the Stars and Stripes over the halls of Montezuma. The event is immortalized in our hymn. These were hard, tough, dedicated Marines, a breed made that way by the grand old man of the corps, Colonel Archibald Henderson, commandant for 39 years.

(Spotlight off. Remove figure from floor.



Bring 1871 figure on floor. Music plays "Battle Hymn of the Republic.")

ANNOUNCER. November 10th the 1870's. Marines completed the first in a series of successful landings in Korea. Captain McLane Tilton led his detachment in the assault, on the forts, guarding the approaches of Seoul. For their heroism in this fight, private Hugh Purvis and Corporal Charles Brown, were awarded medals of honor. Meanwhile, Marines were writing new pages of history for the corps, in expeditions and engagements throughout the world . . . Uruguay, Mexico, Haiti, Argentina, The Bering Sea, Chile, Panama, Nicaragua, Japan, Okinawa, and China.

(Spotlight off figure. Remove figure from floor. Bring 1900 figure on floor. Spotlight on. Music plays "Over The Sea")

ANNOUNCER. November 10, 1900. By now, the list of names, places and marines, forming the battle history of our corps, had grown to long to recite. (Pause) the *Maine* was sunk . . . America and Spain were at war. The first United States troops landed on Cuban soil . . . The Marines . . . first to fight . . . You know the place . . . Guantánamo Bay! Here, Huntington's battalion routed the Spaniards, in swift, well conducted fighting. Sergeant John Quick, stood amidst shot and shell, to signal the guns of the *Dolphin* offshore . . . He saved his fellow marines and earned the medal of honor.

In far off China, Private Dan Daly, single-handedly smashed three boxer attacks, outside the besieged legation in Peking . . . There was a marine for you!

(Spotlight off. Remove figure from floor. Bring World War I figure in. Spotlight on. Music plays "Over There, Mademoiselle.")

ANNOUNCER. November 10, World War I. Belleau Wood, Blanc Mont Ridge, and the crossing of the Meuse. Men will long remember those marines, and their army comrades, who outfought and defeated the elite Russian infantry . . . "Retreat hell! We just got here". After successfully repelling German attacks, the devildogs swept them from the battlefield. Allied enthusiasm knew no bounds. This was the turning point. General Pershing pronounced the action "the Gettysburg of the world war". A grateful French government re-christened Belleau Wood. "The wood of the marine brigade". Marines earned 13 medals of honor, and added another first for the corps, when a marine aeronautic company, was the first completely trained and equipped, American flying unit, sent overseas during the war.

(Spotlight off. Remove figure from floor. Bring 1930 figure on floor. Spotlight on. Music plays "Honeysuckle Rose.")

ANNOUNCER. November 10, 1930's. The so-called peaceful years between world wars, were anything but peaceful for marines. They put down revolts in Latin America, guarded the mails, fought bandits, and protected American interests everywhere. Meanwhile, they wrote the book on amphibious warfare, pioneered close air support, worked out the tactics for small wars, and counter-insurgency . . . places like Santo Domingo, Haiti, China, Guam, Nicaragua . . . names like Puller, Brown, Ellis, live in memory—became history—legends in their own time.

(Spotlight off. Remove figure from floor. Bring World War II figure in. Spotlight on. Music plays Glenn Miller.)

ANNOUNCER. November 10, World War II. The war to end all wars. The corps exploded from 19 thousands to almost a half a million men and women. (Pause) Battered and bleeding from the infamous attack, on Pearl Harbor, a desperate and determined Nation, built a mighty war machine—first to fight—marines—they stormed ashore at Guadalcanal. The old breed . . . and air-ground team, strengthened by the traditions, of those marines, who had gone before . . .

skilled and professional in the attack. They fought, and ground their way, across the Pacific. New Georgia, Bougainville, Tarawa, Cape Gloucester, Eniwetok, Saipan, Tinian, Peleliu, Iwo Jima, Okinawa . . . names we will never forget . . . fortitude, courage and bravery, that the world will never forget. "Uncommon valor was a common virtue."

(Spotlight off. Figure off floor. Bring Korean figure on floor. Spotlight on. Music plays "China Night.")

ANNOUNCER. November 10, the Korean war. Only five years after World War II, our Nation joined with nineteen others, to fight and stop, a new tyranny, a new "ism". At first, the situation was desperate.

The defenders were pushed into a small perimeter at Pusan. (Pause) First to fight . . . Force in readiness. . . . A brigade of marines were thrown into the breach. . . . They were everywhere plugging holes . . . (Pause) and then a whole division of marines struck deep behind the enemy, at Inchon. Once again our reserves, proved their readiness, as they had in World Wars I and II. Once again, the air-ground team went into action . . . this was a new breed, but the same story . . . dedication, courage, professionalism, they carved new names in the hallowed halls. Koto-Ri, Hungnam, Chosin . . . in every clime and place. . . . It was freezing cold. . . . "Retreat hell! . . . We'll come out of here like marines . . . and we'll take our dead and wounded with us".

(Spotlight off. Remove figure from floor. Bring 1967 figure in. Spotlight on. Music plays "A Taste of Honey.")

ANNOUNCER. November 10, 1967. A new and bigger Marine Corps . . . but the marine is the same . . . first to fight . . . indomitable courage . . . ready . . . Da Nang, Chu Lai, Phu Bai Star Light, Harvest Moon, the demilitarized zone, Con Thien. . . Major Reilly, Major Lee, Captain Barman, Captain Carroll, Sgt. Howard, Sgt. Coffman. New places, new names . . . marines . . . they fight in every clime and place, where they can take a gun. Their flag's unfurled to every breeze. (Pause) On this our 192nd birthday and for all our marines in Vietnam, we especially salute the Helicopter pilots and crewman, whose courage and skill, have meant life to so many marines, and to the Navy medical and Chaplain teams. We pay humble tribute to you. You wear our uniform, you share our victories, and more than share the fateful toll, of casualties. All hail our brothers in Vietnam.

(Spotlight off. Remove figure from floor. Music plays "America the Beautiful." Sergeant major and first sergeant move onto floor.)

ANNOUNCER. During the past 192 years, the Marine Corps, has been nurtured on tradition, devotion to duty, loyalty to country, and to the Corps. His deeds have established him, among the elite, in the history of warfare. Pride in himself, his Corps, and his country, is still his hallmark. From the Halls of Montezuma, to the shores of Tripoli, to Mount Suribachi, to the jungles of Vietnam, he's unfurled our flag, to every breeze. (Move onto microphone. Spotlight on. Messages are read.)

ANNOUNCER. The traditional MCB message authorized by Gen. John A. Lejeune will now be read by 1st Sgt. C. J. Garland. Ladies and gentlemen, a birthday message from Gen. Wallace M. Green, Commandant of the Marine Corps. A birthday message from the CG, MARCOT will now be read by Sgt. Maj. B. R. Stabile.

(Remove microphone. Spotlight off. Sergeant major and first sergeant march off floor. House lights up.)

(Music plays "Semper Paratus." Escort personnel march in junior to senior.)

(Music plays "Attention." Escort off. Commands Present arms. commanding officer and guest walk in.)

ANNOUNCER. Ladies and gentlemen, enter-

ing the line of march at this time, the commanding officer of the Marine Air Reserve Training Detachment. Colonel Christopher M. Canan and the Honorable Mister JAMES A. BURKE, Congressman, from the 11th District of Mass.

Escort off. When commanding officer is in place commands "Order Arms."

Music plays "Attention Columbia." Color guard marches in an halts three-quarters down aisle.

Escort off. Commands "Present Arms." Music play "National Anthem."

Escort off. Commands Order Arms. Post the Colors. Color guard splits and moves to position.

Music plays "Marine Hymn." Cake escort wheel cake into room. Stop in front of colonel. Post.

Escort off. Commands Parade Rest. Place microphone in front of colonel.

ANNOUNCER. Please be seated. Commanding officer introduces head table, says a few remarks, Honored guest speaks.

Remove microphone from commanding officer.

Commanding officer says, "May I have the sword, sir?" Cake escort gives sword to commanding officer. Help with plates knife.

Commanding officer offers piece of cake to guest of honor. Next slice to oldest marine. Next slice to youngest marine.

ANNOUNCER. As is our custom, the honored guest is the first to taste the cake. The commanding officer then presents a piece of cake to the oldest marine on active duty. M. Sgt. David L. Schnieble, born September 7th 1908.

The next piece of cake is presented to the youngest marine on active duty, L. Cpl. Kenneth G. Sehavillim, born August 6th 1948. Who we hope, may one day, receive the first piece of cake.

Cake escort. Moves cake to side of floor. Escort off. Commands Attention, Present Arms.

Music plays "Stars and Stripes Forever." Color guard marches from room.

When color guard has left, commanding officer and guests leave.

Escort off. Commands Order Arms. Escort march out in reverse order.

Cake escort marches out after escorts have cleared the room. Bring sword with you.

Music stops when cake escort has cleared room.

ANNOUNCER. Thank you for your kind attention during the ceremony. Dancing resumes in 5 minutes.

## THE UNITED STATES CANNOT JUST "QUIT" VIETNAM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the increasing clamor in the United States for unilateral summary withdrawal from Vietnam does not reflect realism or understanding on the part of those who propose such action. However much one prays for peace or hopes for an end to conflict, it is still necessary to recognize the realities confronting this Nation which at the moment bears the burden of leadership throughout the world.

I think the matter is placed in perspective in an editorial contained in the Sacramento Bee of November 14, 1967, which I now include in the Record:



# THE UNITED STATES CANNOT JUST "QUIT" VIETNAM

There is increasing clamor, in the United States and abroad, for the United States to withdraw summarily from Vietnam and say to the two Vietnams: "A plague on both your houses." The temptation is real but this represents a policy as unrealistic as that advocated by the most hawkish—that we move against North Vietnam with unlimited war and "get it over with."

The consequences of an abrupt American withdrawal are obvious:

It would lay bare all of Asia to a Communist sweep, either through political takeovers or with so-called "liberation" armies.

Red China would gain immeasurably in prestige. It is Red China which has talked the hardest war and with summary American withdrawal Mao Tse-tung would emerge as the uncontested power in all of Asia.

India with its 500 million people and its strategic location, politically and militarily, would be exposed to a siege by China more stern than it yet has experienced and there is grave question that India, internally weak, could stand up to the test.

Lastly, by pulling out summarily the United States would be caricatured as faithless in the eyes of the rest of the world—and in abandoning Vietnam totally, it also would have to abandon all in Asia. Even Japan probably would be forced, through the harsh realities, to come to some accommodation with Red China, which would insulate the United States influence even more.

No. The United States cannot just "quit." It is caught on that other horn of dilemma, as well. It cannot accelerate the war to that total engagement urged by those who simply cannot understand why we do not go in and pulverize the North.

The only acceptable solution is political. And this solution would have to be the joint product of a paper war on many fronts—through neutrals, through the United Nations, through the courts of world opinion, through constantly applied pressures.

In the meantime, there is no alternative but to "hold." In the end, whatever peace can be extracted out of this difficult situation probably will come only after the United States goes from an aggressive war to a containment war—limited to defense and to a show of the flag.

The Orientals have an inbred patience for this kind of attrition; only history will reveal whether we can beat them at their own game.

## LABOR DISPUTE AT ABC

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a cause of great concern to me that one of the leading radio and television stations in my district is now in its eighth week of a labor dispute, with no settlement in sight. This is one of a number of stations in various parts of the country owned and operated by the American Broadcasting Co. which is involved in a labor dispute with the National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians, AFL-CIO.

Obviously such a prolonged dispute presents a number of causes for concern: There is the concern for the welfare of the striking employees and their

families and the financial hardship they are enduring. Then there is the deterioration in service to the community rendered by this company which operates in an area of public service under a franchise granted by the people of the United States. Also, there is the residual damage in labor-management relations which is the inevitable result of a prolonged strike.

Without attempting to judge and resolve all the issues involved in this dispute, I would nevertheless point out that one of ABC's major competitors, the National Broadcasting Co., negotiated with this same union and managed to come to terms without a strike. It is my understanding that NABET has asked ABC for a contract identical with the one achieved with NBC.

In view of this there is a temptation to reach the conclusion that ABC is playing a frivolous and capricious game with NABET, to the detriment of the public at large and the union members and their families in particular.

The suspicion is raised that ABC may be trying to use the strike to develop leverage for its proposed merger with the International Telephone & Telegraph Co. This merger, as I am sure my colleagues will recall, has been opposed by our Department of Justice. Certainly it is to be hoped that this large broadcasting firm would not stoop to manipulating its employees and their families as pawns in a larger game not related to the issues of the company's differences with NABET. Some positive effort by the broadcast company to bring about an early agreement with the union in this dispute would erase this suspicion.

## PETITION FROM THE CWA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of petitions addressed to Congress, which have been circulated by the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO. The headline on these petitions reads: "You don't like riots? Neither do we!" The petition then goes on to point out that jobs, housing, and education—in sufficient quantity and quality—are needed if we are to get at the basic causes of urban disturbances.

Many of my constituents have signed these petitions to this honorable body, and I am sure many of you have received some of these petitions, too. I would like to take note of the CWA petition campaign by having the complete text of the petition printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—YOU DON'T LIKE RIOTS? WELL, NEITHER DO WE!

Americans everywhere agree that action must be taken now to eliminate the causes which lead to rioting and civil disturbances in our nation.

The recent lives lost and property damaged in riots that ravaged our cities proved that the cities and states cannot carry the burden alone.

Only the Congress of the United States has both the responsibility and authority to pass the laws and appropriate the funds for jobs, housing and education needed now by the millions of impoverished Americans.

History itself has taught us that where these three basic needs are left unmet, all races are trapped in filthy, rat-infested ghettos ripe for rioting or in deplorable conditions which are "dead-end." The answer is creative, constructive, practical program that will benefit all Americans directly or indirectly—not a giveaway!

Therefore, we, the undersigned, believe Congress must act by providing:

1. Jobs: Put people to work. As recommended by the President's Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress, the government should become "the employer of last resort" by providing public service employment opportunities for workers who are unsuccessful in competing for jobs in private industry. This would put every American who is able and willing to work on a job.

2. Housing: Slum housing in this nation must go; unsafe, infested buildings must be cleaned up or closed down and decent shelter must be built. Money appropriated for this purpose must be spent carefully and efficiently, and new funds must be appropriated as needed.

3. Education: A policy should be adopted and implemented to provide free public education from pre-kindergarten up to and including the doctorate level for all, with only ability and motivation serving as qualifying factors.

By means of this petition, we make known to you that the American public demands the action that is needed now to solve the problems of the cities.

This petition sponsored by members of the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO.—The Community-Minded Union.

## LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, NOVEMBER 18

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the freedom-loving Latvians have never been numerous or powerful enough to defend their liberty in their historic homeland in the Baltics. Most of their modern history has taken an uneven and sad course, and during most of that time, they have been subjected to the regimes of alien overlords. In the late 18th century, their country became part of the czarist empire of Russia. When that regime was overthrown in 1917, the Latvian people asserted their freedom and proclaimed their national independence on November 18, 1918.

After that memorable day, Latvians enjoyed freedom for two decades, before they again lost their independence. During the interwar years, they worked hard to make their homeland safe from invaders. They rebuilt their war-ravaged country, reconstituted their democratic institutions, and lived happily under



their own democratic government. Unfortunately this interlude did not last long. The rise of a dictatorship in Germany and the aggressive designs of Stalin on Latvia threatened the country's independence. Early in World War II, Stalin carried out his design, and the Red army invaded, overran, and occupied Latvia in 1940. Then the country was annexed to the Soviet Union and Latvia became one of the Soviet Socialist Republics. Thus Latvia's independence was crushed.

From 1940 until the present time, the Latvian people have known no freedom. Since the end of World War Two, the Kremlin has strengthened its firm hold over the country and Latvia now suffers under the Communist totalitarian tyranny. On November 18, the 49th anniversary of the freedom of the Latvian people, we hope and pray for their independence.

#### PETITION FROM THE CWA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge and record receipt by my office of petitions directed to me by constituents of the 11th Congressional District of Indiana. The subject of these petitions is the stated need for action on a larger scale than ever before, to provide jobs, housing and education as long-range solutions to the riots in American cities. It is my understanding that these petitions were originated by the Communications Workers of America, a union widely known for its concern with problems beyond the plant gates.

It is my feeling that, through the act of affixing their signatures to these petitions, American citizens are showing their alertness to the dangers of future rioting in our cities, and hope to see something done about it before it is too late. I should like to make known by this means my own appreciation for this expression of public opinion in a matter of the utmost importance to our society as a whole.

The petition follows:

PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—YOU DON'T LIKE RIOTS? WELL, NEITHER DO WE!

Americans everywhere agree that action must be taken now to eliminate the causes which lead to rioting and civil disturbances in our nation.

The recent lives lost and property damaged in riots that ravaged our cities proved that the cities and states cannot carry the burden alone.

Only the Congress of the United States has both the responsibility and authority to pass the laws and appropriate the funds for jobs, housing and education needed now by the millions of impoverished Americans.

History itself has taught us that where these three basic needs are left unmet, all races are trapped in filthy, rat-infested ghettos ripe for rioting or in deplorable conditions which are "deadend." The answer is a creative, constructive, practical program

that will benefit all Americans directly or indirectly—not a giveaway!

Therefore, we, the undersigned, believe Congress must act by providing:

1. Jobs: Put people to work. As recommended by the President's Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress, the government should become "the employer of last resort" by providing public service employment opportunities for workers who are unsuccessful in competing for jobs in private industry. This would put every American who is able and willing to work on a job.

2. Housing: Slum housing in this nation must go; unsafe, infested buildings must be cleaned up or closed down and decent shelter must be built. Money appropriated for this purpose must be spent carefully and efficiently, and new funds must be appropriated as needed.

3. Education: A policy should be adopted and implemented to provide free public education from pre-kindergarten up to and including the doctorate level for all, with only ability and motivation serving as qualifying factors.

By means of this petition, we make known to you that the American public demands the action that is needed now to solve the problems of the cities.

This petition sponsored by members of the Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO. The Community-Minded Union.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON ENJOYS STRONG SUPPORT OF PRIME MINISTER SATO

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson and Prime Minister Sato of Japan have reaffirmed the close friendship and mutual respect that links our two nations. During his visit, the Prime Minister reaffirmed to the President his view that reciprocal action should be expected of Hanoi for a cessation of bombing of North Vietnam. And he also expressed support for the U.S. position of seeking a just and equitable settlement in Vietnam. He noted that he had found widespread support during his trips in Southeast Asia for free world determination to check Communist aggression.

Japan has a strong and stable democratic government under the effective confidence in elections held early this year.

On the international scene, our Japanese friends, who for a decade and a half concentrated on building up and strengthening their own country particularly in the economic sphere, are playing an increasingly important role.

Japan's many initiatives during the past year or two in support of Asian regional development, for example her leading role in the establishment of that very promising institution, the Asian Development Bank, are vitally important for the future of Asia. Happily, although our two countries are geographically separated by a mighty ocean, we share a very similar view of the world

scene. We are bound by other ties. Japan is our largest overseas trading partner—our two-way trade is now about \$6 billion a year. We have a multitude of mutually beneficial exchanges in the scientific and cultural fields. But most of all we value Japan as a strong and effective partner in our common task of bringing about peace and a better life for all the people of Asia. This partnership has been strengthened by the skills of two great leaders—Lyndon B. Johnson and Eisaku Sato.

Under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD the joint communique issued yesterday by these two leaders following their meeting at the White House:

JOINT COMMUNIQUE BETWEEN PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AND HIS EXCELLENCY PRIME MINISTER SATO OF JAPAN

I

President Johnson and Prime Minister Sato met in Washington on November 14 and 15, 1967, to exchange views on the present international situation and on other matters of mutual interest to the United States and Japan.

II

The President and the Prime Minister declared that the United States and Japan, guided by common democratic principles of individual dignity and personal freedom, will continue to cooperate closely with each other in efforts to bring about world peace and prosperity. They took note of the importance of reinforcing the authority and role of the United Nations as a peace-keeping organization, of promoting arms control and a reduction of the arms race, including the early conclusion of a Non-Proliferation Treaty, as well as of rendering effective assistance to the developing countries, particularly those in Southeast Asia.

III

The President and the Prime Minister exchanged frank views on the recent international situation, with particular emphasis on developments in the Far East. They noted the fact that Communist China is developing its nuclear arsenal and agreed on the importance of creating conditions wherein Asian nations would not be susceptible to threats from Communist China. The President and the Prime Minister also agreed that, while it is difficult to predict at present what external posture Communist China may eventually assume, it is essential for the free world countries to continue to cooperate among themselves to promote political stability and economic prosperity in the area. Looking toward an enduring peace in Asia, they further expressed the hope that Communist China would ultimately cast aside its present intransigent attitude and seek to live in peace and prosper alongside other nations in the international community.

IV

The President reaffirmed the continuing United States determination to assist the South Vietnamese people in the defense of their freedom and independence. At the same time, he made it clear that he was prepared to enter into negotiations at any time to find a just and lasting solution to the conflict. The Prime Minister expressed support for the United States position of seeking a just and equitable settlement and reaffirmed Japan's determination to do all it can in the search for peace. He also expressed the view that reciprocal action should be expected of Hanoi for a cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam. The Prime Minister noted that he had found widespread support during his Southeast Asian trips for free world efforts to cope with Communist intervention and infiltration.



The President and the Prime Minister agreed that it is important that the new Government in South Vietnam continue its progress toward stable democratic institutions and the social and economic betterment of its people.

V

The President and the Prime Minister exchanged views frankly on the matter of security in the Far East including Japan. They declared it to be the fundamental policy of both countries to maintain firmly the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan in order to ensure the security of Japan and the peace and security of the Far East. The President and the Prime Minister recognize that maintenance of peace and security rests not only upon military factors, but also upon political stability and economic development. The Prime Minister stated that Japan is prepared to make a positive contribution to the peace and stability of Asia in accordance with its capabilities. The President stated that such efforts on the part of Japan would be a highly valued contribution.

VI

Referring to his recent visits to the Southeast Asian countries, the Prime Minister explained the efforts these nations are making in a spirit of self-help toward achievement of greater welfare and prosperity for their peoples, but noted their continued need for assistance in their efforts. The Prime Minister stated that it is the intention of the Government of Japan, in meeting this need, to continue its efforts to provide more effective bilateral and multilateral assistance to the Southeast Asian region particularly in the fields of agriculture, fisheries, transportation and communication, by increasing the amount of assistance and liberalizing its conditions. The Prime Minister described the encouraging trends which he had observed particularly in Southeast Asia toward greater regional cooperation and he cited the promising prospects for the Asian Development Bank and its Special Funds. He further stated that it is the intention of the Government of Japan to make greater use of these institutions by assisting in further expanding their operations. Recognizing the need to strengthen economic assistance to the developing areas, particularly to the Southeast Asian countries, the President and the Prime Minister agreed to maintain closer consultation with each other in this field.

VII

The President and the Prime Minister frankly discussed the Ryukyu and the Bonin Islands. The Prime Minister emphasized the strong desire of the Government and people of Japan for the return of administrative rights over the Ryukyu Islands to Japan and expressed his belief that an adequate solution should promptly be sought on the basis of mutual understanding and trust between the Governments and people of the two countries. He further emphasized that an agreement should be reached between the two governments within a few years on a date satisfactory to them for the reversion of these Islands. The President stated that he fully understands the desire of the Japanese people for the reversion of these Islands. At the same time, the President and the Prime Minister recognized that the United States military bases on these islands continue to play a vital role in assuring the security of Japan and other free nations in the Far East.

As a result of their discussion, the President and the Prime Minister agreed that the two Governments should keep under joint and continuous review the status of the Ryukyu Islands, guided by the aim of returning administrative rights over these Islands to Japan and in the light of these discussions.

The President and the Prime Minister further agreed that, with a view toward minimizing the stresses which will arise at such time as administrative rights are restored to Japan, measures should be taken to identify further the Ryukyuan people and their institutions with Japan proper and to promote the economic and social welfare of the Ryukyuan residents. To this end, they agreed to establish in Naha an Advisory Committee to the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands. The Governments of Japan and the United States of America and the Government of the Ryukyu Islands will each provide a representative and appropriate staff to the Committee. The Committee will be expected to develop recommendations which should lead to substantial movement toward removing the remaining economic and social barriers between the Ryukyu Islands and Japan proper. The existing United States-Japan Consultative Committee in Tokyo will be kept informed by the High Commissioner of the progress of the work of the Advisory Committee. It was also agreed that the functions of the Japanese Government Liaison Office would be expanded as necessary to permit consultations with the High Commissioner and the United States Civil Administration on matters of mutual interest.

The President and the Prime Minister also reviewed the status of the Bonin Islands and agreed that the mutual security interests of Japan and the United States could be accommodated within arrangements for the return of administration of these islands to Japan. They therefore agreed that the two Governments will enter immediately into consultations regarding the specific arrangements for accomplishing the early restoration of these islands to Japan without detriment to the security of the area. These consultations will take into account the intention of the Government of Japan, expressed by the Prime Minister, gradually to assume much of the responsibility for defense of the area. The President and the Prime Minister agreed that the United States would retain under the terms of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan such military facilities and areas in the Bonin Islands as required in the mutual security of both countries.

The Prime Minister stated that the return of the administrative rights over the Bonin Islands would not only contribute to solidifying the ties of friendship between the two countries but would also help to reinforce the conviction of the Japanese people that the return of the administrative rights over the Ryukyu Islands will also be solved within the framework of mutual trust between the two countries.

VIII

The President and the Prime Minister exchanged views on trade and economic policies following the successful conclusion of the Kennedy Round negotiations. They considered that a continued expansion of world trade would be in the best interests of both countries and pledged continued close cooperation in pursuit of this objective. They reaffirmed their support for policies which would lead to a freer flow of trade and further liberalization of other international transactions. They agreed that their two Governments should continue to consult closely regarding trade and economic problems between the two countries with a view to finding mutually satisfactory solutions. They noted that early restoration of balance in each of the two countries' worldwide international payments was of basic concern to both and agreed to assist each other toward this end. In this regard, and with a view to making possible the continuation and expansion of mutually beneficial trade and financial relationships between the two countries and promoting the development and stability of the Asia-Pacific area, they agreed to enhance the usefulness of the Joint United

States-Japan Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs by establishing at an early date a subcommittee. This subcommittee will be a forum for consultation on economic and financial matters of importance to both countries, including the short and longer-range balance of payments problems of the two countries.

The President and the Prime Minister expressed their satisfaction with the active and expanding scientific cooperation between Japan and the United States. They especially recognized the contributions made by the United States-Japan Cooperative Medical Science Program which was established as a result of their last meeting in January 1965, and the continuing achievements of the United States-Japan Committee on Scientific Cooperation.

The President and the Prime Minister discussed the peaceful exploration and use of outer space, and noted with satisfaction the recent entry into force of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, a new milestone in mankind's progress towards peaceful uses of outer space. They reviewed space cooperation to date between the United States and Japan, and surveyed possibilities for future cooperation. They agreed that the two Governments should look more closely into such possibilities, focusing on the development and launching of earth satellites for the scientific research and peaceful utilization of outer space.

The President and the Prime Minister, aware of the increasing importance of the oceans as a source of food for the world's growing population and as a source of minerals, have agreed to seek ways of greatly expanding United States-Japan cooperation in research and in development of technology for the utilization of marine resources through the United States-Japan Conference on Development and Utilization of Natural Resources. For this purpose they have agreed that as part of the United States-Japan natural resources program, there should be prepared a report and recommendations to the two Governments looking to cooperation between the two countries in this field.

The President and the Prime Minister recognized that the promotion of peaceful uses of atomic energy has immense possibility of furthering the welfare of mankind and noted with satisfaction that there exists a close cooperative relationship between the two countries in this field. In this connection, the two leaders expressed satisfaction with the smooth progress of the current negotiations to conclude a new agreement for cooperation in this field. The Prime Minister welcomed in particular the intention of the United States Government to increase the supply of such nuclear fuel as U235 and plutonium to Japan.

X

The President and the Prime Minister were satisfied with their second meeting which was extremely useful and expressed their desire that close personal contact continue in the future.

#### FOOD FOR THOUGHT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.



Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Thanksgiving holiday season is close at hand, and this delightful holiday is the best time to take stock of our Nation's plentiful assets. As Americans, we have indeed been the recipients of much material wealth. Our food resources, in particular, are so vast that we have come to view what little hunger that still exists in our land as a blemish so outrageous that it demands immediate redress. Hardly ever have men been so estranged from the concept of hunger that proof of its existence should be rejected as unreal.

The poor and the hungry of this Nation are not alone in seeing some irony in Thanksgiving celebrations. All American consumers who wish to enjoy Thanksgiving dinners must first pass through a trial of wits made necessary by food packagers. Modern packaging and labeling practices are among those items least worthy of thanks by American consumers.

The following article by Harriet Van Horn, in the November 15 New York Post, discusses the issue of truth in packaging most effectively:

#### FOOD FOR THOUGHT

(By Harriet Van Horne)

With Thanksgiving drawing near, a housewife's thoughts turn to the feast and its fixings. We hear such harrowing tales of hunger these days that a small sting of guilt walks with us to the supermarket. Wherever we look, there's all-cheering plenty with her flowing horn. Autumn is perhaps the one season of the year that turns marketing into a rich esthetic experience. Or it would if one could only keep that cost of living index out of mind, to say nothing of the shady practices of food packagers.

Lately I find myself brooding over these matters as I stand rapt before mounds of apples, polished to a ruby gloss. Who can resist new apples, or boxes of cool, wine-dark grapes or flaming persimmons with their soft, secret sweetness? Even the squash, that pig's snout among the fruits of the earth, takes on a bizarre beauty in this setting.

But the beauty isn't all that takes the housewife's heart. Her greatest satisfaction in buying fresh foods is the certain knowledge that Nature—wise, honest, unpackaged, unrefined, unadulterated old Mother Nature—is not going to cheat her.

When you buy a sack of apples or a bunch of celery you need have no worries about slack weight, false labels, make-believe bottoms, dishonest dilutions or dangerous foreign bodies. If you buy a huge, 10-ounce garden tomato it is not labeled "jumbo economy size." It's simply a big, fat tomato and you pay a little more, not less. One ought to rejoice in the fruits of the autumn because they never cheat us, and never mind the esthetics.

A housewife is not so blessed as she pushes her little cart among the packaged and canned goods. There's a corrupt tree somewhere in the food industry and it has been bringing forth corrupt fruit. That famous truth-in-packaging bill hasn't yet brought the whole truth to our jars, boxes and tins.

It isn't likely that Miss Betty Furness, the consumer's friend at court, will bring about any significant reforms, either. And let nobody quip, "Well, that's show business." It's Congressional business. And the business of lobbyists, pressure groups and all sorts of special interests. And my indignation, which rises to fever pitch whenever I notice how much empty air exists between the contents of a box and its top, has been raised even higher by a new book, "The Thumb on the Scales or the Supermarket Shell Game."

In this angry but always reasonable tirade against the food cheats, A. Q. Mowbray indicts not your local A&P or Food Fair but the huge packagers and processors of food-stuffs. American shoppers, who spend \$71,000,000,000 per year for groceries deserve a fairer deal. In Mr. Mowbray's view, they "have their pockets picked" every time they buy a 100-foot roll of waxed paper that's 75 feet or a large economy size jar of coffee that screams, "seven cents off." Sometimes the price is not only not off, it's higher.

Against all such chicanery the truth-in-packaging bill, passed last year, was supposed to protect us. As Sen. Philip Hart originally conceived the bill, it did just that. But a formidable opposition, led by Sen. Everett Dirksen, the business man's friend, succeeded in emasculating the bill. The food industry was asked to write "voluntary" standards of practice, another case of the fox guarding the chicken coop. We are, it sometimes seems, a manipulated society, not a free one.

The defense of the food people is that the average housewife is too shrewd, too quick and clever to be deceived by any sort of trick label or packaging. Well, the American housewife is lovable, well-meaning and generally sensible. But she's no match for the merchant princes of the grocery world.

#### THE LAW AND GENERAL HERSHEY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, according to a report in this morning's New York Times, General Hershey has apparently done it again. The Director of our Selective Service has requested Government appeal agents to act as informers by turning in all men whom they believe are violating our draft laws. I sincerely hope that this latest tampering with our legal system will be canceled.

General Hershey has demonstrated his casual attitude toward our legal tradition even more dramatically in the past. Last week, he instructed local draft boards to revoke deferments of those students who obstruct the administration of draft laws, thus making military service equivalent to a punishment. This dishonors both our military services and our courts. His instructions would violate both legal due process and the commendable service tradition of our Armed Forces by making such service a penalty for law violations. All in all, it has been a busy week for the general.

I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following trenchant editorial on this subject that appeared in the November 12 edition of the Long Island Press:

#### DISRESPECT FOR THE LAW

Selective Service Chief Lewis B. Hershey has good reason to be angry with draft law violators—but his remedy is the wrong one.

Gen. Hershey, apparently encouraged by the White House, would revoke the deferments of college students who won't carry their draft cards or who interfere with draft or military recruitment. Those liable to the draft who violate the law, he said, should be offered the choice of military service or jail.

We went through something like this last year when Gen. Hershey was rebuffed by the courts for recommending that the local draft boards deprive some sit-in demonstrators in Michigan of their deferments and reclassify them as eligible for the draft. The Court of Appeals ruled the action illegal because the draft boards had violated the registrants' right to free speech.

Congress has since passed a law providing maximum penalties of five years in prison and a \$10,000 fine for persons who illegally interfere with the draft law or regulations issued under it.

It is up to the courts—not the draft boards—to deal with possible violations. And the distinction must be carefully drawn between those who simply protest against the draft and those who violate the law.

What's more, it is demeaning to the service and all the royal youngsters doing their stint to equate that service with jail. A violation of the law should send someone to jail, not into the army.

If it is true, as Gen. Hershey charges, that the Justice Department has not been getting after draft violators vigorously enough, then it would make more sense for the White House to get Justice on the ball than to prod Gen. Hershey into exceeding his authority.

It seems that everyone involved in this mess is treating the law poorly—the extremists for carrying their anti-draft protest beyond the law; the Justice Department for dragging its feet in going after them, and the Selective Service chief for trying to usurp the functions of the courts.

#### VETERAN TEACHERS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSTOSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the other day President Johnson made an eloquent plea to the leaders of the various veterans organizations for assistance in recruiting our returning veterans into the field of teaching—especially in the ghetto areas of our Nation.

I have received a copy of the President's remarks and have found them to be of great interest to me. As a former schoolteacher, I feel that the President's proposal has much merit behind it and if the Veterans' Administration presents any specific program to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, I feel that it will receive the support of all the members of the committee, and we can enact the necessary laws to put this proposal into effect.

Because of the country's need for improved education of our youth, I believe that my colleagues should have the benefit of the President's remarks on this subject. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include the President's remarks in the RECORD, as follows:

#### REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE RECEPTION FOR LEADERS OF VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

First I want to ask your understanding for my being late. I have been late most of my life. But I seem to be—as age advances and the Prime Minister has come to town a—little later than usual.

I am sorry that I couldn't be here with you when the reception began.



For all last year and this year we have been hoping that we could get together. Bill Driver has talked to us a number of times about it—also the Veterans Committees in the House and Senate—to have a little reception here in honor of the Veterans organizations who provide the leadership for the veterans of this country.

There are 26 million men and women who have served this nation, who have protected it—and who are protecting it this hour.

Last weekend I saw thousands of them. General Wheeler asked me to try to come to see the Marines on the Marine Anniversary. I ate so much Marine cake I don't get on the scales anymore.

But I have had my problems with the Marines as some of you have observed from the newspapers.

All my life being an old Navy man—and seeing Senator Yarborough here an old Army man—we just have to put up with these Marines because every time you hear from them they say, "The Marines have landed and everything is in good shape."

So I told them of my visit that is just exactly what happened to me right here in the White House. The Marines landed and everything is in good shape and we are going to have a wedding here in a few days.

While we are working on this one over here in the Mansion for my daughter, one of them was messing around over here in my office and married my secretary.

But I went out to see these fighting young men and women who represent the very best in America.

We first went to Fort Benning, Georgia. I have never been more inspired than when I saw the men who were taking their parachute jumps there, and when I saw them out practicing guerrilla warfare.

Then we went to El Toro and Camp Pendleton for the Marines.

Then we went out on the Enterprise Carrier and spent the night with 5,000 men and saw them take 100 planes off in the afternoon and night and bring them in. The Enterprise, you know, has been on Yankee Station out in Vietnam and will be back out there again in January.

Then we went to the Air Force where our fighter and bomber pilots were just coming from Vietnam—men with over 100 missions.

Then we wound up in Yorktown with the Coast Guard.

So we covered them all.

I had dinner in the Captain's Cabin with enlisted men. They were looking down at Admirals who were sitting at the other end of the line. The fact that one of them was from Comfort, Texas was purely coincidental.

But I don't need to tell you that these young men and women and their fighting comrades in Vietnam represent the very best that this country produced.

If there is one thing I learned from talking to all the Generals, Admirals, enlisted men and the others, it is that we are giving them a quality product of manhood and womanhood today that they have never received before.

That is no compliment to you and I, Ralph. But they are better than we were.

Every man there told me they were better than we were. That, we are very proud of.

I know you veterans are very proud of it because we are going to need our best for the tough, demanding, unfinished business that is ahead. We have plenty of it.

I want to get down to business very quickly because I have an idea and I want to make a sale. I want to promote you. I want to get you in here to roll up your sleeves and start doing something for these veterans, as you have been all of these years.

Last year, 600,000 veterans returned to civilian life. Next year, it will be 800,000. Every month we are mustering out about 70,000 veterans—every month, 70,000.

Eric Hoffer, our longshoreman friend from

out there in California, calls these veterans the "seed of the future." You city boys may not know what that means, but we farmers do.

They are a very great, tremendous, natural resource—and national resource. We ought to realize that and recognize it. Their energies, their ambitions, and their efforts are going to determine what kind of a country we live in and the kind my grandson lives in.

I want to plant this seed. I want to put it down where it will do the most good in the most fertile soil. I want it to grow. I want to harvest the children in this country because education is the guardian genius of democracy. If you don't want totalitarianism, if you don't want dictatorship, if you don't want communism, you just pour the education to them. That is what we are doing.

I talked to the leaders of the land-grant colleges this morning. I am talking about our elementary school problems tomorrow, but I am talking to you now about educated children—my own roots have been in the classroom. That is where the action is; that is where the future is. When I leave here, that is directly where I am going—to the classroom because nowhere is the challenge of tomorrow greater than it is in our schools and particularly in our elementary schools.

Nowhere is it more real or more urgent than in the ghetto schools.

I doubt that any of you here live in a ghetto. But you ought to live in one long enough to understand what it is about—and have a little compassion—to decide to do something about it.

If we don't, it is going to wreck our Nation. The children in these ghettos need the teaching most and they get it least.

If you were a teacher, would you like to be a college professor, or would you like to be a high school teacher? Yes, in that order—and an elementary school teacher? Yes, elementary school teacher in a ghetto? That is the last place you want to be.

So that all the good ones are pulled out of there. We have to put somebody back there who wants to do something about cleaning up those ghettos and doing something about those poor children—the ones who need it most. That is what I want to talk to you about right now.

These are the children who can't recognize the picture of a Teddy Bear. This is a serious situation when we are living in a world where four out of 10 children, and four out of 10 adults, and four out of 10 people cannot read "cat" and cannot spell "dog."

Then we talk about how proud we are of the 20th Century. They are A-plus students when it comes to recognizing a rat because they have had more experience with rats than they have had with Teddy Bears; or a garbage can, or a knife, or a beer bottle.

They can't tell you about colors because their lives are so drab. Why? Because too often there is no one in the house to ever teach them, no one to read to them, no one to give them any kind of good example, no one to give them loving discipline.

We have two wonderful daughters. I think the thing that is helping them more than any other thing is every morning when they wake up, every night when they go to bed, and every time their mother sees them in the daytime she always says, "Remember, mother has got confidence in you and mama cares. You are loved. You are loved." She says that to the two daughters all the time.

But these poor ghetto children don't have that, because their mother is gone and their father—they don't have one sometimes because he is not there.

Our figures show that between now and 1975 2½ million teachers will enter or re-enter elementary school teaching. We will only need 2.2 million.

But here is the problem: Our high schools will have more than they need and our grade

schools will not have what they need; 6,000 less than they will need every year between 1970 and 1975. But it is even worse than that.

The schools that are going to suffer are the schools where the children need the teachers the most—the ghetto schools, the forgotten rural schools, the little bordertown schools, the Indian reservation schools.

The richer schools can pay higher salaries, they can offer better working conditions—they can hire the teachers.

But the poor schools just cannot. Too often they get the dregs and the leftovers. They need the best teachers the most. They get the worst ones.

Here is the job that I want you to do for me. Here is the new battle ground where I think our Veterans belong. I want them not only to protect our freedom abroad—I want them to protect our freedom and our liberty right here in our cities.

I want to find Veterans who want to teach. I want to give them the chance to teach these neglected children. They are teaching in Vietnam now.

One of the things that I am most proud of is the compassion that our soldiers, particularly our Marines right up in the DMZ are showing for poor children—their health problems, their education problems. They fight all day and go at night to teach them. That is where I got this idea.

Four and a half million Veterans have been discharged since Korea. In that 4½ million only 100,000 of them are teaching—67,000 Veterans are discharged every month and only 1500 teach.

So I want to encourage many more Veterans to teach. All you Veteran Service officers from all of the States were invited here. Your representatives are here tonight. I got my picture made with you. Are you listening? I want to talk to you right now.

I want to encourage more Veterans to teach. If they don't know how to teach now, I want to, with some of my Senators' and Congressmen's help, help them be taught how to teach themselves—and we want to teach them how to teach.

These men and women have something rare, something unusual, and I think something wonderful to offer if they have served in our uniform. They can bring to the ghetto classrooms what few others can. They can bring there whatever children need—example, experience, integrity, honor, courage, faith, hope and love of country demonstrated by being there when they needed you.

There are too many children who do not have a father or mother in the house. The men of Vietnam can show them what a man can be and what a real man is like—and what a man should be.

I don't know anyone in the world who can show it better than the men who have worn the uniform in Vietnam or other places and come out.

So who knows what the challenge to democracy is better than they do? Many of our Veterans are no strangers to the agonies of the ghetto. They know the suspicion and hostility of the ghetto. They fought for their own freedom in the ghetto. Some of them came out of there.

Then they went to fight for a nation's freedom in Vietnam. Now they can come home to continue the fight as teachers to win freedom for others who need them desperately.

One month after I came into office I said: "Why can't we lower the IQ requirements, the mental requirements, and why can't we lower the physical requirements so we can get out and at least take some of these boys who might not be good soldiers or good fighters, but teach them to get up early in the morning, to get a cold shower, shave and be on time—give them some discipline and training—and they might learn to mow a lawn."

I saw Mr. McNamara on the plane. Then I got Senator Russell down and went hunting



with him—and got him to agree to take 12,000. Now we have 100,000. They have already enlisted 49,000 who have an average of fifth grade reading ability.

We are bringing them out of these places and putting them in there. You know the proudest thing I heard on this trip was one old seasoned, crusty General came up to tell McNamara the story of the program.

We said, "What about these at the bottom of the heap who we brought in and trained?"

He said, "I got the shock of my life. We have 47 of them who are going to officer's schools."

That shows you, I want to get some of these men who have come back from fighting for their country trained to be teachers—we don't know what we will call them; we will call them the Veterans Teachers or something—to come and go into these ghettos over the country; go there, stay with them, and teach them so we can save those children, those cities, our country.

Therefore tonight I am requesting and appointing the Veterans Administrator, William Driver—there has never been a better government employee—he is like the rest of us. He has out-married himself.

But I am asking Bill Driver to work closely with Secretary Gardner, Commissioner Howe, and to keep in contact with the House Veterans Committee, members of both parties, and the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee, and Finance, who handle veterans legislation—work closely with them—because I want them to develop a plan to enlist the returning veterans in this challenging new assignment.

I want to invite your thoughts on it. I want your organizations to give us any suggestions you can about it. I talked to Mr. McNamara about it during my lunch hour today when Mr. Bunker was sitting there.

I said, "This is what I am going to suggest tonight if I can get there. I don't want somebody undercutting me tomorrow—how do you feel about it? Is it not a good idea or is it?"

He approves it wholeheartedly.

So we will go out before these men are discharged and, with the help of the veterans organization, we will say to these men, "You not only have protected our freedom wherever that flag has gone, you followed it and you brought it back without a stain on it. You can protect our citizens and our future right here at home by taking this job. If you are not qualified to do it now, we will qualify you to do it. We will give you training that is necessary and you get out there and give these children the kind of teaching they are entitled to in the richest Nation in the world—that is going to have a Gross National Product of \$850 billion next year."

I think you care about the veterans. I think you care about the country. I don't think I am presumptuous in assuming that.

If you do care about the veterans, and you do care about the country, here is a chance to do something for both of them.

You always have to pay for your supper. You have paid by listening.

Thank you very much.

#### OUR NATION'S PRIDE AND STRENGTH IS IN MEN LIKE CPL. GEORGE R. GIBSON

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age, when the great unwashed mi-

nority of beatniks, peaceniks, Vietniks, and others of their ilk hold undue attention in the public eye, we are often prone to forget that a far greater majority of our men serve our country's cause with quiet courage and valor. Theirs is the true strength of our Nation—strength, courage, and valor often far above and beyond the call of duty, such as exemplified by Marine Cpl. George R. Gibson of Pasadena and Houston.

Here is a man who now holds the Nation's second highest award for valor and courage in combat, and his is a story in which all America can take pride. His is a story in keeping with our Texas heritage of the citizen-soldier. To this young man, to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. G. W. Gibson, 3308 Bluefield, Pasadena, and to those who are proud to call him friend and neighbor, I extend my own sincere congratulations. May the Almighty ever grant our Nation men like George R. Gibson.

I urge my colleagues and the American people to read the story below, containing the official citation which accompanied the award of the Navy Cross to Corporal Gibson, and to share with me the great pride in this outstanding American:

#### CORPORAL GIBSON GAVE GREAT PERSONAL VALOR

PASADENA.—Want to know what a hero does that makes him a hero?

Then read the citation that accompanied the Navy Cross given recently to Corporal George R. Gibson, whose parents, Mr. and Mrs. G. W. Gibson, live at 3308 Bluefield in Pasadena.

Though Corporal Gibson is now a Houston resident, he has worked in Pasadena and is well-known here.

It has been said that more attention is given the draft card burners and the protesters than the loyal Americans.

Read, then, what Corporal Gibson was doing while some "Americans" were playing at being hippies, burning their draft cards and otherwise failing to contribute.

The award was presented to Corporal Gibson by Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, Marine Corps deputy chief of staff during a Navy Day program in Houston. Here's what the accompanying citation said:

#### "CITATION

"For extraordinary heroism as an Automatic Rifleman while serving with the Second Platoon, Company E, Second Battalion, Fourth Marines during Operation Prairie in Vietnam on 8 August 1966. His platoon was being evacuated by helicopter from an area northwest of Cam Lo, Quang Tri Province, when it was attacked by North Vietnamese Army units utilizing automatic weapons fire and barrages of hand grenades. The half of the platoon that had not been successfully evacuated was quickly surrounded. Casualties mounted as enemy forces in reinforced company strength threatened to overrun the friendly positions. Corporal Gibson observed a Marine, wounded and helpless, almost within the grasp of the advancing enemy.

"He immediately, with complete disregard for his own safety, left his covered position and exposed himself to murderous enemy fire to provide fire support for the evacuation of the wounded man. The Platoon Commander rallied the platoon for a counter-attack and Corporal Gibson leaped from protective cover and charged into the enemy fire. Although painfully wounded by a grenade, he continued to press the attack until the original positions had been retaken.

"Knowing their only chance to hold was to

obtain more ammunition, he unhesitatingly crossed twenty-five meters of fire-swept terrain and returned with the badly needed ammunition. Observing a machine gun that was not manned, Corporal Gibson immediately put it into action and, disregarding barrages of enemy grenades and accurate small-arms fire directed at him, courageously stood his ground until the North Vietnamese withdrew to reorganize for another attack.

"The second attack was accompanied by vicious automatic-weapons fire and grenades, and despite being painfully wounded again by machine gun fire, he continued to fight, killing six additional enemy. The North Vietnamese set up a machine gun that threatened to enfilade the Marine position. Corporal Gibson moved out on the fire-swept slope in full view of the enemy, flanked the weapon, and single-handedly knocked it out, killing its crew.

"His courageous initiative, indomitable fighting spirit and unselfish devotion to duty were contributing factors in the successful removal of the wounded and in saving the lives of many of his comrades. His great personal valor reflected the highest credit upon himself, the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service.

"For the President:

"PAUL H. NITZE,  
"Secretary of the Navy."

#### THE DANGER OF INVESTIGATIVE FILES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1967, a speech was delivered on the floor of the House describing the alleged activities of certain employees of the United Planning Organization in Washington, D.C. The primary target of the speech was a young, able, and thoroughly admirable lawyer, Mr. Hal Witt, who was for a time the acting executive director of UPO, and who is now its deputy director. The allegations against Mr. Witt, given under the protection of congressional privilege, were in general that he was a member of, or a contact of, certain organizations which did not find favor with the speaker; that he was the son of his father; and that he had the misfortune to choose as his attorney, for the defense of a minor police matter 7 years ago, an attorney who has represented the Communist Party.

The young man responded to each of the allegations against him by denying most of them, but answering each of them pointblank. Although the speaker who castigated Mr. Witt denied that he was accusing Mr. Witt of being a Communist, the implication was clear.

I am not here today to go over each of the specific charges made against Mr. Witt, because I believe his response speaks for itself, and I am inserting it as an appendix to the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. What I am concerned with, however, is that the speaker alleged that the source of his information was the FBI files as well as help from the House Committee on Un-



American Activities and the Washington, D.C., police. If that is the case, then we have a far more serious problem reflected in this incident.

I, myself, was a member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a number of years. At that time, as now, J. Edgar Hoover, the Director, had insisted that the investigative files of the FBI not be made available to those outside of the agency. His stated reason is that the investigative files are not screened for truth or falsity; that they contain every tidbit of information that can be picked up, including malicious gossip, outright falsehood, and even the meanderings of unbalanced minds. Therefore, merely because information is contained in the FBI files does not mean that it is true and correct. No Government agency, including the Department of Justice, dares rely on information merely because it is in the FBI file. Before a criminal prosecution is brought, information is checked and doublechecked, because of the awareness that investigative files are, of necessity, like sponges: they absorb everything; they screen nothing.

I would assume that similar caution would apply to police files of the Metropolitan Police Department. We should also be aware of the fact, by this time, that the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities similarly cannot be trusted, when disgorged, to reflect only the truth.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed for two specific reasons. First of all, that investigative files filled with hearsay, malicious gossip, falsehood, and flights of fancy, should be the basis for serious charges against any individual. Second, I am disturbed that the sanctity of those files have been breached. Are investigative files of the FBI that are refused even to courts, because of their unreliability, to be blithely leaked to any Congressman who desires them? Are investigative files of the Metropolitan Police Department available for character assassination on the floor of the House? And lastly, to what extent has the House Committee on Un-American Activities been the collector, the coordinator, and the culprit in this most unfortunate incident?

These are serious questions; questions which we should all ponder. Charges so lacking in substance that can be made against Hal Witt can be made against any of us. This House has the responsibility to find the answers to these questions. If, in fact, investigative files of the FBI and the Metropolitan Police Department were improperly opened and made available, how did it happen and how can it be prevented from happening again?

I am hopeful that we are not in for a new period of McCarthyism, a period which I had hoped we had outgrown. The Washington Post, in a brilliant editorial, cogently summed up this most unfortunate, regrettable incident. I offer this editorial at this time for insertion in the RECORD, as well as the story in the Washington Post of November 15, 1967:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 6, 1967]

#### BROYHILLISM

It is necessary to characterize Congressman Broyhill's attack on Hal Witt, deputy director of the United Planning Organization, in

plain terms for precisely what it is: it is cowardly and contemptible—cowardly because it was made behind the curtain of congressional immunity, contemptible because it was made up of the sort of spittle customarily dribbled out by the House Un-American Activities Committee. It accused an honorable and able young lawyer of "close and frequent" Communist connections on the basis of his alleged—and denied—membership in organizations the Congressman dislikes and on the basis of his father's bad reputation many years ago.

It happens that this attack comes at a time when Hal Witt has just rendered a service of exceptional importance to this community. Without compensation, he helped as co-counsel to conduct the long series of appeals which led finally to the release of the Giles brothers and the correction of a shocking injustice. His whole record as a member of the bar and as a public servant entitles him to respect and confidence.

The incident reminds one, almost inescapably, of a moment in the so-called Army-McCarthy hearings nearly 14 years ago when Sen. Joseph McCarthy made a similar slurring attack on a young lawyer associated with the Army's special counsel, Joseph N. Welch. Moved to tears, Mr. Welch said to the Senator: "Until this moment, Senator, I think I never really gauged your cruelty or your recklessness. . . . Have you no sense of decency, sir, at long last? Have you left no sense of decency?"

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 15, 1967]

#### BROYHILL LAYS RED LINK TO WITT

(By Peter Millus)

Rep. Joel T. Broyhill, (R. Va.) yesterday accused Hal Witt, deputy director of the United Planning Organization, of having "close and frequent" Communist connections.

"I do not say Mr. Witt is a Communist," Broyhill said. "I do not know. I do know that a very real question as to his loyalty should prohibit his employment by a public agency."

Witt replied angrily later in the day that Broyhill's statement was "disgraceful, irresponsible and untrue," and challenged him to make it off the House floor. A Congressman is not legally liable for what he says in the House Chamber.

Broyhill's accusations were his second attack on UPO in two weeks. The Virginia conservative is fighting the antipoverty bill now on the House floor. He claims the antipoverty program fosters dangerous radicalism, and is offering UPO as an example.

Witt is one of 15 people Broyhill named yesterday, who now have or once had some kind of connection with UPO. His complaints against them ranged from supposed Communist associations to narcotics convictions to membership in the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee and CORE.

Broyhill, in his bill of particulars, said that Witt's father, Nathan, was a communist, that Witt is on the executive board of SANE (an anti-war group) and "a frequent attendant, if not a member, of the Washington American Forum, successor to the Progressive Party here." Broyhill also said that Witt belongs to the local committee to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, and that his name is on the mailing list of the Fair Play For Cuba Committee.

The Congressman found significance in the fact that Witt's attorney, when he was arrested for disorderly conduct here in 1960 (at a Civil Rights demonstration) was Joseph Forer, whom Broyhill called "the leading attorney for the Communist Party, described by a member of the Communist Party as one of the most important Communists in D.C." Broyhill said finally that "according to information from FBI files, Mr.

Witt has close and frequent association with many known Communist Party members."

Witt said he is no longer on the SANE board (though he noted that some Congressmen are members of the group), that he never heard of the Washington American Forum, that he has absolutely no connection with the anti-HUAC organization here and that he received no mail from the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

He said he is not a communist, never has been, and has never sympathized with the Communist movement.

He has no idea what the FBI has in its files, Witt said, noting that if the FBI thinks he is a communist, "There is no telling who else they think is one." Forer, he said, is simply "a brilliant and able lawyer."

"My father," he said finally, "is indeed Nathan Witt." Witt said that Broyhill's statement was an attempt "to find a man guilty of association."

Forer said, "I guess everybody's a radical to that idiot Broyhill. What Broyhill says about me being a communist is a complete fabrication. He's a liar."

Broyhill's office could not identify the source of the statement that Forer was "one of the most important communists" here.

The office said the information about Witt's alleged connections with SANE, the Washington American Forum, the anti-HUAC group and the Cuba committee came from the Metropolitan Police Department's file. The office said that the information may originally have come from the FBI, but it was not sure.

Broyhill's aides said they assembled yesterday's allegation with help from HUAC as well as city police and the FBI.

The remarks from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 14, 1967, previously referred to, follow:

MR. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, last Wednesday, I discussed the use by many employees of the United Planning Organization in Washington of their connection with OEO as a springboard for promoting radicalism.

If you catch a burglar on the scene, and he has a record of burglary, is carrying a burglar's tool kit and a burglar's loot in his pocket, he becomes a suspect. Not necessarily one that will wind up in jail, or, if he does, one who will stay there, but a suspect nonetheless.

If you catch a man with blood on his hands and a dead body nearby, he is likely to be detained even under the current legal versions of arrest and confinement.

If you catch a known firebug at the scene of a conflagration, with a can of kerosene in his hands, the logical, but far too often not legal conclusion is that he is a likely candidate for a grand jury.

As I pointed out last week, Mr. Chairman, the Office of Economic Opportunity is loaded with people of questionable background and association who have been placed in positions of responsibility, and who are supposed to be training others to become useful and productive citizens. I stated at that time that I felt we are sowing the seeds of our own destruction when we provide financing for large numbers of radicals who use their working hours and the people they are supposed to train, to plan ways of turning their trainees against our Government and our way of life.

I have been asked for more specific details, Mr. Chairman, and I should like to name here a few of these public servants and tell you something about them.

Beginning at the top, a Mr. Hal Witt was Acting Executive Director of UPO from May until last month, and is now Deputy Director at \$21,000 a year.

Mr. Witt is the son of Nathan Witt, a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. He is on the executive board of SANE—a regular sponsor of antiwar demonstrations. He



is a frequent attendant, if not a member, of the Washington American Forum, successor to the Progressive Party here. He is on the Washington Area Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. His name is on the mailing list of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. His police record reveals that when charged with disorderly conduct in 1960 he chose as his attorney, Joseph Forer, the leading attorney for the Communist Party, described by a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., as one of the most important Communists in the District of Columbia. According to information from FBI files, Mr. Witt has close and frequent association with many known Communist Party members as well as financial backers of the Communist Party.

I do not say Mr. Witt is a Communist, Mr. Chairman. I do not know. I do know that a very real question as to his loyalty should prohibit his employment by a public agency.

The Daily Worker, January 10, 1965, advertised a meeting in New York City to honor the 40th anniversary of the Communist publishing firm, International Publishers. Listed as a featured speaker was Marlon Barry, now a \$50-a-day consultant at UPO. Barry was head of SNCC's New York office then, and moved to Washington in June 1965 to expand the SNCC office here. He had been arrested and convicted on various charges in Memphis and Knoxville, Tenn., and in Chicago. He became somewhat infamous in the District last year by kicking a door of a paddy wagon while being arrested. He led a march on the Capitol under the label of "Assembly of Unrepresented People," protesting the Vietnam war; led a bus boycott protesting fare increases; mapped the "Free D.C. Movement," boycotting merchants who refused to sign home rule petitions and contribute funds to home rule causes.

One of Barry's close SNCC associates is Rev. Channing Phillips, who heads the Housing Development Corp., recipient of around \$294,000 in 1966 from UPO and \$100,000 from HUD. He joined in the merchants boycott, cochaired the Coalition of Conscience, led a sleep-in at Bolling Air Force Base; chaired the Committee for Community Action in Public Education, which sponsored the school boycott and paid much of the expenses of the Hobson against Hansen case which resulted in the resignation of Dr. Hansen from his position as Superintendent of Schools in the District.

We all know the antics of Hubert Gerold Brown, known as Rap Brown. He was a UPO employee from March 1965 until June 1966, when he resigned to take the SNCC chairmanship from Stokely Carmichael.

Also active in SNCC while at UPO were Alan and Margaret McSurely, who left here to go to Kentucky where they were charged with possessing seditious materials, including Communist literature and films. While Alan McSurely was director of suburban programs for UPO, he, with two other UPO employees, William N. Hobbs and John Robinson, threatened the Arlington chief of police during a march sponsored by a group known as ACCESS in which they participated.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] recently called to the attention of the House the fact that the same John Robinson was involved just last Tuesday in a violation of the Hatch Act, in passing out partisan political literature and working at the polls on election day. Here, Mr. Chairman, is an example of the Government paying a man for partisan political activity. The taxpayers of the United States will not tolerate this use of our funds.

Gaston Thomas Neil, a UPO worker in the Cardoza area, runs the New School of Afro Thought. He has spent time in St. Elizabeth's Hospital after being found not guilty by rea-

son of insanity on a number of narcotics charges. He now has other charges pending against him not yet resolved. Meanwhile, he and a companion bought two Russian-type carbines in Alexandria in August, for what purpose we can only guess.

Ralph Fertig, former executive director of UPO Southeast Neighborhood House, helped with the school boycott. He came to UPO from Chicago, leaving behind unpaid judgments and a record including protests against the Un-American Activities Committee and advertisements urging clemency for the Rosenbergs.

Dick Jones, a UPO community organizer, Herbert Kelsey, a UPO housing coordinator, and Michael Searles, UPO housing adviser, are all SNCC members. Mrs. Willie Hardy, UPO Neighborhood council director, is in both SNCC and CORE.

This list would not be complete without Ruby Evans, UPO girls' service coordinator, who although not involved with the militants, urged her girls to refuse birth control information, telling them they should not be prevented from having illegitimate children if they want them.

Finally, Rufus Mayfield, the young hoodlum who was there when a TV set went through a window; when the Redskin band had to leave a ball game under police protection; when a fire broke out in a dime store; when trouble developed at the Coliseum and looting followed; when poverty warriors marched on the White House. In spite of a concerted effort of the Washington press to show his activities in a favorable light, he is constantly skirting the edge of trouble, and hundreds of 13 and 14-year-old boys acknowledge him as their leader.

Mr. Chairman, one radical in these OEO sponsored programs in a position to employ others can load a payroll with those who think and act as he does. This has happened in Washington, D.C., and may be happening all over the Nation. The decent people of this Nation—and I mean the decent poor as well as those living in better circumstances—deserve better leadership than UPO is giving them.

#### SOUTH FLORIDA AIDS POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we are all acutely aware of the hardships now facing local poverty programs across the country. The lack of funds to support the various programs has forced many to close down their operations, depriving the poor of the services and assistance which have meant so much to them in the past several years.

Some programs were terminated in my own district in south Florida, when Federal funds ran out.

I am proud to say, however, that the threat of closing was eliminated by the quick and wholehearted support of private and public organizations in Dade County.

Additional funds have been made available by the Dade County Public School Board, which has agreed to loan the poverty program \$333,000 to help support the Headstart program. This

money will pay for staffing the program which feeds and takes care of 2,400 disadvantaged preschoolers.

WKAT, a local radio station in Miami loaned \$20,000 to the war on poverty to keep the legal services project going until the Congress completes its legislative action. In a release announcing their action, WKAT said it could not "see poor people needlessly suffer."

WKAT's expression of concern for the public welfare is indeed commendable, and I thank the station for its support of the poverty war at this critical time. I insert the WKAT editorial from November 8, 1967 at this point in the Record:

#### WAR ON POVERTY PROBLEMS

The Congress, debating financing for the war on poverty, declined to extend funds to continue the various poverty projects now underway while the debate goes on. This has created a crises of sorts in the local offices of the economic opportunity programs all across the country. In Dade County, it has threatened the action programs, including such projects as: Operation Head Start, day care centers, and the like, and it also would have brought to a standstill the legal services program; which through its eight neighborhood offices has 1,890 legal cases now pending in the courts. It is most unusual for a radio station, whose normal business is to report and reflect the news, to make the news. But, WKAT felt that the unfortunate poor who have entrusted their cases to this legal services program would be needlessly harmed if the cases were stopped, even though they were to be started again, if the Congress appropriates money to continue in the future. Therefore, WKAT felt it necessary, as a concerned part of our community, to loan the \$20,000 necessary to keep the legal project going until the Congress does act. It was difficult for us to stand by, while politicians went about the business of professional politics, to see poor people needlessly suffer. We urge the Congress to debate and conclude this matter as soon as possible and to stop the unnecessary confusion that is spreading through this enormous project.

#### WESTMORELAND SEES U.S. PHASE-OUT IN 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post contains a front-page story this morning which reads in part as follows:

VIET REPORT TO HOUSE UNIT QUOTED: WEST-MORELAND SEES U.S. PHASEOUT IN 1969

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

Gen. William C. Westmoreland was reported to have told the House Armed Services Committee yesterday that in two years the United States should be able to begin phasing out its operations in Vietnam.

Rep. Richard H. Ichord (D-Mo.) reported that the General, back for conferences with President Johnson and other high officials, emphasized that the "phaseout" did not mean a "pullout" in two years.

Rather, the General meant that a start in transferring to South Vietnamese troops some of the combat load Americans now



carry would be possible if all goes as expected, Ichord said.

The White House and Defense Department declined to comment on the report.

At the White House, meanwhile, Mr. Johnson reminded the Nation that mankind has not yet "found a way to preserve freedom without defending it."

At 11 a.m. today, the President will report to the Nation in a televised conference on the Vietnam talks he has had this week with Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and Deputy Ambassador Robert W. Komer. (The conference will be televised live on Channels 4, 5 and 7.)

The comment on the necessity of defending freedom came as the President presented the Medal of Honor to Staff Sgt. Charles B. Morris of Galax, Va.

Westmoreland, a house guest at the White House while here for consultations, stood with the President during the East Room ceremonies.

Earlier, Westmoreland expressed "cautious optimism" in a closed-door report to the Senate Armed Services Committee, Chairman Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.) reported. But he said the general "does not see any early termination of the war."

Russell said that the general reported "some gains" as well as "some difficulties." The difficulties, he said, relate to the sanctuaries the enemy has in Cambodia and north of the demilitarized zone and the "tremendous" supplies from other Communist allies.

"I think we are making progress, but we have a long hard road unless we move in and close all Communist shipping supplies," Russell said after hearing Westmoreland.

Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), another Committee member, said that Westmoreland believed North Vietnamese troops are better equipped now than previously but are not well led.

"He feels quite confident," Jackson said, "He sees the enemy losing steadily and continuously."

Bunker reported on the war to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee but failed to sway Administration critics. Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) said there was "little to be encouraged about." Sen. Wayne Morse (D-Ore.) said facetiously that Secretary of State Dean Rusk had "loaned (Bunker) his cracked record." Sen. Albert Gore (D-Tenn.) said, "This is about the 13th optimistic report we've had."

#### CONFER WITH JOHNSON

Both Westmoreland and Komer conferred separately with the President yesterday. The latter is in charge of economic development programs.

Bunker conferred with the President earlier in the week and is expected to meet him again before returning to Saigon with Komer late next week. Westmoreland will leave earlier next week.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara told newsmen at the Capitol that this week's meetings do not signal significant policy changes. He said he did not "anticipate any changes." This has been the general view here of the week's conferences.

We are concerned today with Vietnam expenditures of nearly 800 million dollars a week. It is interesting to contrast the above article with the following article from Newsweek magazine of October 14, 1963, where we anticipated a stage-down by the end of that year in which we were spending \$10 million per week.

The article follows:

#### VIETNAM: WIN WITH WHOM?

In Paris, on the eve of her departure for the U.S., Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu was as radiant as ever. Was she frightened at the prospect

of her visit to the U.S., a reporter asked Vietnam's "Dragon Lady," sister-in-law of President Ngo Dinh Diem. The emeralds in her ears glittered as she tossed her head. "The only thing I'm afraid of is hairy caterpillars." How about the Communist Viet Cong and their guerrilla war against the Vietnamese Government? "It is really not a war any more," smiled Mme. Nhu. "The scale of operations has been greatly reduced . . . I am optimistic."

In the past, Mme. Nhu's "optimism" about the war has not always been shared in Washington. But the Kennedy Administration, unable to dislodge the Ngo family from power in Saigon, has moved into another of its "Win with Diem" phases, and before she even stepped off the plane in New York this week, Mme. Nhu was pointing out that the White House has again come around to her way of thinking. After a whirlwind seven-day, fact-finding tour of South Vietnam, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor submitted a rosy report to President Kennedy. Its essence, as published in a formal U.S. policy statement: "The military program in South Vietnam has made progress and is sound in principle." A thousand of the 15,000 U.S. advisers may, in fact, be withdrawn by the end of the year, "[and] the major part of the U.S. task can be completed by the end of 1965."

"The political situation in South Vietnam remains deeply serious." And while Diem's repressive actions against the Buddhists have not so far "significantly" affected the military effort, "they could do so in the future."

McNamara had perhaps given Diem a slight slap on the wrist; but far more important was his apparent conviction that the war in Vietnam—which is costing the U.S. \$1.5 million a day—is indeed being won with the House of Ngo in power. Many wondered, however, how McNamara could have reached such a firm conclusion on the basis of a seven-day guided tour of South Vietnam.

Gloss: It seems unlikely, newsmen reported from Saigon. In An Xuyen Province in the Mekong Delta, for instance, the Viet Cong had gathered enough strength to overrun two major towns last month. It is a province where in one year Viet Cong guerrillas—according to U.S. Army estimates—have increased by 15 per cent. Yet U.S. soldiers on the spot claim McNamara was given the usual "glossy" briefing by senior officers. One officer who overheard what McNamara was being told later admitted: "We were in tears."

Others questioned the 1965 time limit President Kennedy has now set for the completion of the U.S. military mission. "After all, those Communist guerrillas have been out here fighting the French or Diem for nearly twenty years," noted one American official. The report, added Sen. Frank Church (Democrat, Idaho), was simply "designed to snuff out the spreading Congressional revolt against the Diem regime."

It is also quite clear that U.S. officials in Saigon are still deeply split. The CIA, Gen. Paul D. Harkins, and most of the military brass who shepherded McNamara around Vietnam are firm believers that there is no realistic alternative to Diem. Equally firmly, U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge—who last week demanded, and got, the recall to Washington of CIA chief John H. Richardson—holds to the view that Diem cannot win and that he and his family must go.

Lodge may soon be proven right, for Diem remains widely unpopular. Last weekend, in the center of Saigon, another Buddhist monk, the sixth since June, burned himself to death in protest against the government. Three U.S. correspondents who tried to report the suicide were beaten up by Diem's police. It may be possible to win the war in

the paddy fields, but it can certainly be lost in the cities.

In line with the literature I submitted into the RECORD yesterday, I want to further submit the following article of trepidation of the Vallejo Times Herald:

#### BOMBING TACTICS BEST?

The war we are bringing to North Vietnam is not directed against the people of that country but against its government. The aim is to make it as difficult as possible for Hanoi to wage guerrilla war in South Vietnam and ultimately to convince it of its futility. We are prepared to stop the bombing any time the North Vietnamese indicate they are willing to talk to us.

Extreme pains are taken to minimize civilian casualties in our raids. We are told that targets are removed with "surgical precision," although it is inevitable that bombs will stray and that there will be deaths among the civilian population.

We are also told that we have dropped as much tonnage on North Vietnam as in three years of bombing of Nazi Germany.

Against that former enemy, our policy was one of unconditional surrender. The object was to smash Germany completely. It was total war, against both people and government. The needless obliteration of a city like Dresden in the last months of the war was one fruit of that policy.

Unconditional surrender was a mistake, some historians argue. There were many in the German army and government who were ready to overthrow Hitler if the Allies had offered a negotiated peace. Whether this is true or not, whether some other alternative to unconditional surrender could have shortened the war, remains one of the imponderables of history.

Yet future history is being written in Vietnam right now and we have time to choose between alternatives.

It is impossible to wage war—limited or otherwise—against a government and not against the people it rules, however convinced we are that it is an evil government, however much we may feel it does not represent the true aspirations of its citizens.

We fail to consider that when people find bombs raining down upon them, they get mad. Their resolve stiffens, and larger political considerations mean nothing in the face of attacks by an alien enemy.

Hitler made the same mistake in Russia. He was unable to understand that Russian love of country transcended whatever desire the people may have had to be free of dictatorial communism.

All the simple North Vietnamese peasant knows is that American pilots are dropping bombs on him and that these Americans are as much an enemy as were the Japanese and the French.

He knows nothing of Geneva accords and cares not a whit about international legal niceties. He remembers only that all of Vietnam was once one country, and that one foreign power was driven out and has now been replaced by another.

#### WASHINGTON POST DEFENDS HAL WITT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, a Member of the House at-



tacked a young and able lawyer working on the poverty field in this area named Hal Witt. Regrettably, I was not on the floor at the time the charges against Mr. Witt were made. I had met Mr. Witt some years ago and know him at least well enough to be impressed by his conscientiousness and outstanding competence. I was pleased to note that the November 16 issue of the eminent Washington Post editorially, in sharply criticizing the attack on Mr. Witt, made the following reference:

It happens that this attack comes at a time when Hal Witt has just rendered a service of exceptional importance to this community. Without compensation, he helped as co-counsel to conduct the long series of appeals which led finally to the release of the Giles brothers and the correction of a shocking injustice. His whole record as a member of the bar and as a public servant entitles him to respect and confidence.

Unfortunately with the Nation again engaged in conflict, there is an increasing number of accusations made against others attacking loyalties and questioning patriotism. It is sad that this unfortunate concomitant of war is increasingly characterizing debate and public discussions in and out of Congress.

The Post's brief but notable testimonial to Hal Witt is worthy of the permanent RECORD.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON AWARDS THE MEDAL OF HONOR TO SGT. CHARLES MORRIS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the Medal of Honor represents the highest civilian recognition of military bravery and valor which a grateful country can give one of its sons.

Yesterday, President Lyndon B. Johnson, in a touching ceremony which I was privileged to watch, presented that medal to Sgt. Charles Morris, of Virginia, for heroism beyond the call of duty in Vietnam. Sergeant Morris had suffered multiple wounds in Vietnam, yet still fought on for what he and we believe.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress honors itself with the presentation of this medal. It also honors the President who bestows the medal.

I hope one day the Congress will authorize a Medal of Honor for Presidents of the United States who have also served under fire and beyond the call of duty.

Lyndon B. Johnson deserves a medal like that.

Each man in his time and in his own area of responsibility fights the battle for freedom.

Sergeant Morris did it in the rice paddies of Vietnam.

Lyndon B. Johnson does it on the field of policy, foreign and domestic—bearing the criticism of friend and adversary alike.

Yet amidst all this, the President still

pursues an honorable peace in Vietnam and in the world.

He has never lost sight of that consuming goal. And we must never lose sight of that goal.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the President's eloquent and moving statement on the occasion of awarding the Medal of Honor to Sgt. Charles Morris at the White House on November 16:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S REMARKS AT CEREMONY AWARDING MEDAL OF HONOR TO SGT. CHARLES MORRIS, NOVEMBER 16, 1967

One of America's greatest war correspondents wrote about courage—intimately and well.

He called decorations for bravery "pinnacles of triumph" in a man's life, "that will stand out until the day he dies."

Ernie Pyle spoke for all wars—for all those moments when men must reach down into their deepest reserves of courage. He celebrated those times when men risk life for a principle—or a comrade—or a country.

On whatever field, on whatever day—war is an agony of spirit and flesh and mind.

After thousands of years of civilization, the saddest of human failures is this—the precious wealth of man's courage must still be spent on the battlefield.

But all the wisdom of the earth has not yet found a way to preserve freedom without defending it.

Staff Sergeant Charles Morris is one of those who defended freedom on the battlefield. He fought with dogged courage through long hours of hell. He fought above and beyond the call of his duty.

Just a few days ago, I returned from a journey across this land, where I met thousands of his comrades.

I stood with our sailors on the deck of a mighty carrier at sea—and with our airmen under skies filled with America's power. I saluted the men of the infantry and the Marines. I ended my trip at Yorktown, with the men of the Coast Guard.

Some of the men I saw were training for combat.

Many had already been there. They wore its badges—and some wore its wounds.

I saw other badges, too.

I saw the white carnations worn by wives of missing pilots.

I saw loneliness on the faces of waiting families.

I felt humble to be among these men and women. But I also felt a towering pride—pride in them—pride in this nation.

Some good day, war will be only a shadowed memory.

We will labor, with all our passion and strength, to quicken the coming of that day.

But until it comes, our lives, our safety, and our hope of freedom's survival are in the hands of all those who serve—here and in Vietnam.

Sergeant Charles Morris was there when America needed him.

Once before, I stood with him on one of his "pinnacles of triumph." At Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam, just a little more than a year ago, I awarded Sergeant Morris the Distinguished Service Cross.

Today, I am proud to stand with him again—on a hero's highest summit.

Our nation is grateful to you, Sergeant Morris. God bless you.

Secretary Resor will now read the citation.

#### LEADER IN POVERTY FIGHT, CARL DEWEY PERKINS, AN ARTICLE IN THE NEW YORK TIMES ON NOVEMBER 11, 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal reasons for our success in passing the bill to continue the war on poverty in the face of a concerted drive to kill or badly cripple this vital program was the leadership of the tenacious and hard-working chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, Congressman CARL PERKINS, of Kentucky.

I believe that an article published in the New York Times on November 11, 1967, is most interesting in the tribute it pays to the hard-working and dedicated efforts of the distinguished chairman of this committee and under unanimous consent I place this article in the RECORD at this point:

#### LEADER IN POVERTY FIGHT

(By Carl Dewey Perkins)

WASHINGTON, November 16.—When the political world of Adam Clayton Powell of Manhattan crumbled last January, a big, seemingly bumbling man from the mountains of eastern Kentucky fell heir to one of the most sensitive jobs in Congress—chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee.

"Carl's no leader, that's for sure," one committee member said at the time. "But what could we do? He was in line for the job."

This week, Carl Dewey Perkins proved his critics wrong as he and key members of his committee steered the Administration's anti-poverty program through the House virtually intact.

There were concessions, to be sure. The program was trimmed about \$400-million. The control of community action programs was shifted to city halls and county court-houses.

But, for the most part, the program was held intact against repeated Republican efforts to dismantle the antipoverty agency, the Office of Economic Opportunity.

#### COALITION RETAINED

Most of the concessions had been made in committee to lure needed Southern Democratic votes in turning back the Republicans. But even then, painstaking work went into keeping together such an unlikely coalition of conservative and liberal Democrats.

For months, Mr. Perkins wandered around the House chamber and the Democratic cloakroom, placating some Democratic liberals unhappy with the concessions and assuring Southern Democrats that the concessions made the program more politically palatable to them.

"Boys, I need your help," he told Southerners.

He got it.

He is an unobtrusive, unsophisticated country lawyer. His tastes are simple, his clothes are usually a little rumpled. He is conscientious, often working far into the night.

He commands an almost worshipful following in his 23-county Congressional district, one of the poorest in the nation. Frequently, he drives all night from Washington to tour the lonely hollows and villages and hillside farms of the Appalachian region he calls home.

Born 55 years ago (Oct. 12, 1912) on a farm just outside Hindman, a small town in Knott County, Ky., Carl Perkins got his law degree in Louisville at the Jefferson School of Law and then went back home to practice law.

He became commonwealth attorney four years later, served in the Kentucky General



Assembly and then became Knott County attorney.

In 1948, when the Congressional seat became vacant in midterm, he was picked for the job by Gov. Earl Clements. He has won every election since.

#### GENUINE LIBERAL

A genuine liberal, probably the most liberal politician in Kentucky, Mr. Perkins is one of the staunchest Administration supporters in Congress.

During the last two years, when most of President Johnson's Great Society programs were born, Mr. Perkins voted with the Administration 95 per cent of the time.

He is the most persistent education advocate in Congress. For years, he has pressed for general Federal aid for school construction, and he plans to renew that fight next year.

A serious, earnest man, he avoids Washington's cocktail circuit.

He is married to the former Verna Johnson, a first grade teacher in a Washington school, and they have one son, Carl Christopher, 13 years old. They own modest homes in suburban Alexandria and on the outskirts of Hindman, a typical eastern Kentucky town that is just four blocks long.

His one hobby, aside from politics, is horseback riding. Last year, he sheepishly appeared in the House with his arm in a sling. He had broken it in a tumble from a horse.

#### POSTAL LIFE: A NEW PUBLICATION FOR CAREER POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the attention of the Members to the fine job the Post Office Department has been doing with its new publication for career postal employees.

Postal Life, as the new magazine is called, is earning an appreciative following among the 610,000 dedicated workers who are responsible for the movement of more than 200 million pieces of mail per day.

In an army of employees as large as that in a postal system as widespread as ours, it is vitally important that there be a communications system capable of reaching all postal employees, regardless of job or level.

A magazine like Postal Life serves to counteract the sense of vastness and impersonal relations which can be overwhelming in an operation the size of the postal service. Employees need a feeling of direction and identity, and Postal Life represents a much-needed personal touch.

It brings the employee firsthand information on happenings and policies that affect his career and the mail service of the United States. It acts as a necessary liaison between Washington and postal employees throughout the Nation.

The best evidence of Postal Life's success is the mail the magazine has been receiving.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted,

I insert at this point in the RECORD a letter to the Postmaster General from Mrs. Mary J. Blanchard, of South Bend, Ind., who is a postal employee from my home district, commenting on Postal Life:

SOUTH BEND, IND.

MR. LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,  
Postmaster General,  
Washington, D.C.:

I very much appreciated and enjoyed the new magazine, Postal Life.

It seems to me to be a step in the right direction which will inform the employees that something is being done to put the service in step with the rapid increase of the volume of mail.

It was most interesting to me to learn that schools will be conducted to properly train people using the new equipment, for I feel that in this particular field, probably due to the lack of funds, that many areas have been sadly lacking in sufficient training. In particular, the window clerks are put on the windows with the minimum of training and that, to me, seems one area of great importance, for they are the "Face and voice" of the postal service. There are few individuals who ever have contact with any postal clerk other than the mailman or the window clerk.

Your magazine was refreshing, for it revealed insights into the Postal system without having to mull through pages of gripes about wages, hours and so forth. These are things which people knew when they accepted the postal appointment but because (as a whole) they were not qualified for any specific skill, they were glad to accept and be trained at government expense. The other publications consist primarily of this.

Thank you again for the magazine. I shall look forward to receiving the next issue.

MRS. MARY J. BLANCHARD.

ADDRESS OF HON. COVEY T. OLIVER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS, AT THE LATIN AMERICAN FORUM, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, NOVEMBER 14, 1967

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday night of this week November 14, 1967, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Covey T. Oliver addressed the Latin American Forum at Georgetown University here in Washington. Secretary Oliver outlined recent developments in six categories of the "action program" agreed to at the summit meeting of American Presidents at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in April.

Since there has been considerable discussion lately concerning what some prefer to call an "arms race" among certain Latin American nations, I think that Secretary Oliver's remarks in this connection need to be emphasized. As the Secretary pointed out, Latin American military expenditures in relation to their gross national products are lower than almost any other area of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the text of Secretary Oliver's speech follows:

THE ALLIANCE MOVES ON—A REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT SINCE THE SUMMIT MEETING

(Address by Covey T. Oliver, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and U.S. Coordinator, Alliance for Progress, at the Latin American Forum, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., November 14, 1967)

I am pleased to have this opportunity to be with you here tonight to talk about Latin America.

At the outset, I wish to pay tribute to Georgetown University and to the organizers of this Latin American Forum. There is a great need for this kind of intellectual investigation and interchange of opinion concerning inter-American relations. It is indeed a vast and complex subject which does not lend itself to simplistic statements or curbstone judgments.

The kaleidoscope of recent headlines on Latin America is to the average North American reader perhaps more confusing than illuminating. Is there really some kind of "arms race" going on? Does the death of Che Guevara mean that the problem of subversion is diminishing or growing? How much do Congressional cuts in the foreign aid bill damage prospects for the Alliance for Progress? Just what is United States policy towards Latin America?

These are fair questions; there has been a good deal of comment, criticism and debate in the past weeks on these general topics. Tonight I should like to outline for you my views as to the facts and considerations behind many of these questions. Let us review activities in the home hemisphere since the Summit Meeting of American Presidents in April.

Let us start with a definitive policy statement: the keystone of United States policy in Latin America is the Alliance for Progress. We are completely committed to this "vast effort to bring a better life to all the peoples of the Continent," as described in the Charter of Punta del Este. Our policy is directed toward assisting our neighbors to achieve self-sustained economic growth and better income distribution as soon as possible. We wish to see them economically strong, socially progressive and politically independent not only because of our clear desire to be "good neighbors"—but also because it is in our own national interest.

Now, there will be some who will consider what I have just said as so much rhetoric, merely noble words of idealism. So be it. We of this hemisphere who work with optimism and energy to achieve the goals of the Alliance for Progress should never be ashamed of being idealistic, for history has shown that idealism is essential to the attainment of great goals. The objectives of the Alliance do indeed represent a shining ideal—an ideal worthy of dedication of governments and millions of individuals who can both contribute and benefit.

Thus these objectives are the ideal, the genuine desire giving direction to our foreign policy. Shifting our focus from the mountain peak to the rocky and always uphill trail we must traverse, we ask ourselves: how has the hemisphere been doing under the Alliance, in terms of real progress and human welfare?

First, a general answer, then analysis: I conclude that while progress has certainly not been adequate to satisfy the tremendous needs of the people, it has been sufficient to assure the hemisphere that we are on the right track. Events have proved that those who advocate violence, chaos and foreign domination are simply not with it; they are old-fashioned and out of touch. There is growing confidence that though today's problems seem sometimes insurmountable, the Alliance for Progress goals can be reached through the peaceful revolution that is now underway.



As I have said elsewhere, it seems to me that historians of the future will divide the Alliance into three main phases.

Phase I, the first years, was a time for organization, for agreement on the nature of the problems, for stabilization and for mobilization of forces. It was a time for grappling with major economic problems—such as rampant inflation, balance-of-payment difficulties and other distortions that made social and economic growth almost impossible. These problems have not disappeared today, but Latin America has learned how to deal with them more effectively.

Phase II of the Alliance began with a turning point in inter-American history: the Summit meeting of the Presidents of America in Punta del Este. There the Presidents clearly outlined the course to be followed in the next "decade of urgency" and beyond, into Phase III, when many of the Alliance goals will have been met. Today, in this second phase, the emphasis will be on human needs and hopes, on institution-building, and modernization.

The "Action Program" of the Presidents called for activities under six specific chapters. Let us consider what has developed since the Summit in each of these categories.

Chapter I dealt with Latin American Economic Integration and Industrial Development, with a view to creating a Latin American Common Market starting in 1970 and having this common market "substantially in operation" by 1985. They have made a good start along this long and necessarily difficult route. The Latin American Free Trade Association and the Central American Common Market have met to begin the process of merging the two blocks eventually into a group embracing all of Latin America. Within LAFTA, there has been wide acceptance of the concept of automatic tariff cuts and other measures for intra-regional trade liberalization. There have been, not surprisingly, problems to work out: one is the crucial question of differing preferential treatment for the least-developed and for the medium-sized countries. LAFTA officials are presently working to resolve the differences, in preparation for another meeting on this subject early next year.

Meanwhile, the Andean countries—Chile, Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, and Venezuela—are establishing a temporary, sub-regional trade area to allow them to integrate more quickly, and the Commonwealth Caribbean is studying a similar move.

Economic integration, then is moving—still slowly, but with enough progress to provide encouragement that this Presidential directive will be carried out on schedule.

Let me underline the fact that we are talking about a *Latin American Common Market*, which is a Latin American initiative being carried out by Latin American leaders. The United States role is one of offering firm support for this Latin American undertaking. This support is expected later to be in the form of helping to finance some of the economic adjustments that will surely have to be made once the Common Market goes into operation; studies are now being conducted regarding these financial implications.

I cannot leave this subject without mentioning what I consider to be the single most important development since the Summit meeting. I refer to the new, dynamic Latin American leadership now largely determining the course of the Alliance for Progress. The Latin Americans were the major participants in creating the Action Program at Punta del Este, and they with just pride regard it as their own. Economic and political leaders of individual nations, as well as the directors of multilateral agencies in inter-American affairs, are taking imaginative, effective action. In these new and enlightened leaders we see symbols of the Alliance for Progress, the success of which, after all,

will depend mostly upon what Latin Americans do for Latin America, rather than upon the relatively minor assistance that comes from outside sources.

Chapter II of the Action Program called for multi-national action in laying the physical foundations for economic integration through infrastructure projects. Within the vast expanse of the area there is great need to improve the movement of persons and goods and information; efficient telecommunications systems and interconnecting power systems are necessary. Nations jointly must develop international watersheds of frontier regions.

Much of this multinational action will be through sponsorship of the Inter-American Development Bank. A good beginning has been made. With pledges of an additional \$1.2 billion, the IDB will substantially increase its funding of such multinational projects over the next three years. In this regard, the Congress a few weeks ago responded to President Johnson's request that U.S. support to the IDB be increased from \$250 to \$300 million annually, for three years.

Of particular significance has been the activity in the Bank's Preinvestment Fund for Latin American Integration in getting feasibility studies underway of projects which will accelerate multinational development. Areas in which the Fund is operating are transportation and telecommunications, as well as the River Plate Basin plan which would involve the five countries bordering that river and its tributaries.

The third in the Presidents' six items for action is entitled "measures to improve international trade conditions in Latin America." This, of course, is an area of great significance to Latin America, where all too often nations are largely dependent for export earnings upon a single product which in turn may be subject to serious price fluctuations in the world market. With the general trend showing lower prices for agricultural products exported by developing countries, plus higher prices for the finished goods they have to import, we can readily understand why many Latin Americans are deeply concerned about their "terms of trade."

We have made some progress in this difficult matter since last April. As directed by the Presidents, an inter-American Export Promotion Center is being established through CIAP, the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress, under the chairmanship of Dr. Carlos Sanz de Santamaria. An *ad hoc* committee of banana-producing countries is being convened to develop a joint approach to the European Economic Community on eliminating the EEC trade restrictions on bananas. After years of difficult negotiation, agreement was reached in October among major cocoa producers and consumers, towards international stabilization of cocoa prices.

World variations in coffee prices have created serious economic problems over the years, and the International Coffee Agreement has provided some much-needed stability since it went into effect in 1963. This agreement is now being renegotiated. At the August meeting in London of the Coffee Council, tentative agreement was reached on recommended revisions of basic export quotas, the most important issue for producing countries. Progress was also made on enforcement procedures. A final vote on these and other matters is expected at the November 20 meeting of the Coffee Council. Meanwhile, the United States and Brazil are working towards solution of a bilateral problem concerning Brazilian soluble coffee exports to this country.

Study of the matter of trade preferences for Latin America was recommended by the Presidents. Solutions here are not easy to achieve. We in the United States understand

the strong views of developing countries regarding the importance of trade and we agree that some form of preference should be given to their products. We do not think, however, that the answer to their trade problems lies in the proliferation of the type of preferential arrangement now in effect in some areas which discriminates among developing countries.

Since the Summit, we have been working closely with the principal countries of Western Europe to develop the broad outline of a temporary, generalized system of preferences to be granted to all developing countries by the industrialized world. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Special Group on Trade with Developing Countries, consisting of representatives of the U.S., U.K., France and Germany, has agreed on a set of principles and guidelines which might form the basis for such a system.

In other words, the representatives found a consensus which could serve as the basis for a common position of OECD countries at UNCTAD-II next February. This consensus demonstrates two new and significant departures: (1) The United States is now willing to consider offering preferences, and (2) the Europeans are willing to consider a system of generalized preferences which would not discriminate against Latin American exports.

Chapter IV in the President's Action Program calls for modernization of rural life and increase of agricultural productivity, especially of food.

This is a long-range problem of great importance. For in addition to today's urgent need to create better living and working conditions for farm people—some 54 per cent of the entire Latin American population—we must face the fact that having enough to eat may be a stark problem for millions in Latin America in the years to come. Agricultural production simply is not keeping pace with population growth. And even today, many countries are having to use precious export earnings to import foodstuffs.

In the months elapsed since the Summit, we in the United States have been preparing to intensify our assistance in the agricultural area. More importantly, Latin American leaders themselves are giving new concentration to this requirement.

Significantly, CIAP at its recent meeting in Rio decided to take into account demographic factors in its future country reviews. This reflects a growing concern throughout the hemisphere regarding the food-population ratio.

Moving on to Chapter V of the Presidents' program: Education technological and scientific development, and intensification of health programs.

Two major initiatives within the framework of the Organization of American States are now underway in this field:

1) A group of truly distinguished scientists and educators from 12 OAS countries met in Washington in July. They agreed on a long-range program of multinational activities to be carried out by "centers of excellence" in Latin America. Their recommendations will be considered at a ministerial-level meeting of the OAS Inter-American Cultural Council in early 1968. (The U.S. member of this distinguished group is Dr. James R. Killian of MIT.) Thus, through the organized efforts of the inter-American scientific community, plans for a regional science program are taking shape.

2) Similarly, in Education and Culture, an inter-American educational development program is gradually being designed, under auspices of the OAS Inter-American Cultural Council. It seeks to promote inter-American cooperation in this field.

Educational Television, with such great potential for teaching in all underdeveloped areas, has received a good deal of concen-



trated attention since the Presidents met. Experts have been conducting specific studies on opportunities in regional programs, and on the desirability of a multinational training center. Their recommendations will be presented to the OAS Cultural Council meeting in February.

These are a few of the current activities in this general field of education, which is indeed of very high priority in the development policy of Latin American nations. I wish we could take the time here to discuss in depth this question of current and future needs of education in Latin America.

Let me move on to the final item in the Action Program of the Presidents—one that has received a good deal of public attention recently: the elimination of unnecessary military expenditures.

The Latin American Presidents noted that the demands of economic development and social progress make it necessary to apply the maximum resources available in Latin America to these ends. They expressed their intention "to limit military expenditures in proportion to the actual demands of national security, in accordance with each country's constitutional provisions . . ."

Let me emphasize, in case there should be any confusion about U.S. policy in this question, that the United States firmly endorses the objectives of this statement. We do not wish to see our partners in the Alliance spend resources for unnecessary military equipment.

By "we" I mean both the Executive and Legislative branches of the United States Government. The Congress in the pending foreign aid legislation has directed the President to suspend financial assistance to those countries diverting their resources to unnecessary military expenditures and significantly sacrificing their economic and social development. This pending legislation underscores both the concern and the agreement on this subject which the Congress shares with the Executive Branch. At the risk of over-simplifying a complex issue, let me suggest these salient points to keep in mind:

(1) Latin American military expenditures in relation to their GNP are low—lower than any other area of the world except sub-Saharan Africa;

(2) Every independent State must, in the final analysis, determine whether its national requirements make necessary acquisition of specific types of military equipment, especially in view of the fact that Castro-inspired subversion, while now a diminished threat, does remain a threat;

(3) Thus we continue to believe that our Latin American neighbor governments will avoid "unnecessary" military expenditures. But we have indicated to certain countries that qualify that we would be prepared to permit the sale of modest military equipment consistent with their security needs;

(4) Consistent with the directives of the Presidents in Punta del Este, as well as the wishes of the U.S. Congress, the United States will of course continue to take into consideration a given country's economic situation, including military expenditures, in working out with that country bilateral assistance under the Alliance for Progress. Further we have been suggesting to our Latin American colleagues that CIAP, the Inter-American Committee of the Alliance, make this matter a regular part of the systematic CIAP country reviews;

(5) Initiatives are now underway in various Latin American countries to obtain broad agreement on arms limitations;

(6) All considered, while there are always differences of opinion on the extent of military modernization that may be necessary, neither we nor our Latin American colleagues see any arms race in the hemisphere.

These, then, might be considered the highlights of the post-Summit progress report to

you—all too brief, simply because there is a great deal to talk about, and so little time. I should like to have discussed with you, for instance, plans and developments within the private sector, without whose broad benefits to Latin America the goals of the Alliance would be unreachable, out of the question.

Let me close by speaking to you on behalf of our friends in Latin America. For I know that many of these friends are worried—worried about us in the United States, about our attitudes, about what recent activities might mean in inter-American relationships. While our country is better reported to literate or listening Latin Americans than they are reported to us, nonetheless, it is difficult for our neighbors to appraise accurately the nature of our national problems as to Viet Nam and in our cities. They get an unclear picture, and it worries them. They examine proposals made to the Congress favoring protectionism and drastic cuts in our support to the Alliance for Progress—and they wonder just how much they can count on their friends in the North.

To be sure, some of their doubts may be due to their own lack of understanding of how the U.S. system of Government functions—the checks and balances, especially in the foreign policy field. Public declarations from many sources, carried to the corners of the hemisphere by the news services, might well leave many confused and even alarmed.

I must say that at this time I share the concern of many Americans regarding the potential damage to Alliance programs should the foreign aid bill be cut beyond the present approved authorization figure. Neither do I wish to minimize the psychological effect such a cut would have at this time, when Latin American leadership is reaching new heights of effectiveness, when the concept of self-help in local communities and in the area as a whole is producing important new gains for the Alliance. These very gains, however, give me a solid basis for believing that the American people in the long run will not let their neighbors down. I remain hopeful that the Congress will continue to be responsive to this opportunity by appropriating the full amount they have authorized for the Alliance for Progress.

Further, I do not believe that the much-publicized proposals for protectionist moves against imports will ever have success in the United States. Certainly, Latin America will be heartened by the firm determination of President Johnson, who recognizes that such protectionism would hit Latin America harder than many other areas, and has vowed that proposals of this kind shall not become law so long as he is President.

Meanwhile, as we are painfully aware, tonight while we wrestle with the burden of major hemispheric problems, there still remain too many in Latin America who are waiting for the Alliance to touch them in a more meaningful way. All of these efforts directed towards solution of problems outlined by the Presidents at Punta del Este must be translated into personal terms: a new opportunity, a saved child, a piece of land.

And so it shall be. We have but to believe that it can be done and to keep our ideals clearly in focus, as we set about doing what we can, with determination, step by step, day after day.

#### VETERANS' PENSIONS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing two bills today which I believe to be of great importance to our veterans and servicemen and I hope that early action is taken by the Congress on these measures.

The first would restore non-service-connected veterans' pensions which have been reduced or eliminated because of the receipt of increased social security benefits. When social security benefits have been approved, the Congress must insure that veterans and their dependents, now living on pensions, are not injured by a reduction in their pension.

The second would increase group life insurance for our servicemen from \$10,000 to \$30,000. The present maximum limits of \$10,000 has been in existence since 1917. This is unrealistic today and should be increased. This bill would provide an automatic issuance of \$15,000 in insurance to each serviceman regardless of rank. He would then be allowed to purchase coverage in increments of \$5,000 up to a maximum of \$30,000. The passage of this measure would be especially beneficial to our servicemen in Vietnam.

#### MODEL CITIES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Secretary Robert C. Weaver for his excellent remarks in announcing the model cities selections. He explained the extreme difficulty in making a selection from among the 193 applications received by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Clearly and concisely he documented the time-consuming process of reviewing these applications which included an interagency review committee composed of representatives from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Labor; Agriculture; Commerce; and Justice; and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Their mission was clear: To select those neighborhoods, all across the country, where the concentration and coordination of federally assisted programs could have the maximum impact in solving urban problems. And he spelled out the criteria by which they were guided:

Scope of the analysis of the problems involved.

Innovative approaches.

Capacity to carry out the program.

Commitment of city government and private groups.

Geography and population.

Also, Secretary Weaver expressed his hope that many of the cities that applied for the first round, and were not selected for planning funds, would join other localities in applying for the second round. He offered the services of the Depart-



ment to those cities which were unsuccessful to help them develop their applications for the second round.

Mr. Speaker, I found Dr. Weaver's remarks one of the fairest explanations ever to come from a Government official in announcing grant recipients. But, as might be expected, there are some who, dissatisfied with the results, allege that the selections were nothing more than political decisions.

Particularly noteworthy was the charge that since only nine of the sixty-three cities were in Republican Congressional Districts, the question must be raised as to whether merit was a total factor in this selection. For those who so freely employ this statistic, I say—look at the entire list, analyze it, and then you will not so readily charge political favoritism:

Only four States had four cities selected—New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Texas. Of these four, three have Republican Governors.

Cities represented by influential Members of both Houses of the Congress were often unsuccessful. Some were selected, others were not.

Both Cleveland, Ohio, and Los Angeles, Calif., are well represented by ranking Democrats and both have Democratic mayors but their applications failed to meet the program criteria.

And the list could continue. However, I believe that those without prejudice, can easily determine that model cities selections were not made on the basis of political circumstances. I commend Secretary Weaver and his Department for this fair and equitable treatment.

And I hope that none, in disappointment, will lay the blame on political decisions. The record simply does not support such an allegation.

So that my colleagues might read Secretary Weaver's excellent explanation of this selection process, I include the full text of his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY ROBERT C. WEAVER,  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN  
DEVELOPMENT, ANNOUNCING THE FIRST  
MODEL CITIES PLANNING GRANTS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

This is a tremendously significant day for the people of America.

I ask you to come here this morning to announce the list of cities selected to receive the first round of planning grants under the Model Cities program.

I don't think I ever recall, during my years in government, an event in the field of urban affairs which has generated so much interest, so much anticipation—and so much healthy involvement and competition, and so much promise for the future of our cities.

There were 193 applications filed for these planning grants. They came from communities of all sizes in all parts of the country. They came from communities with a wide diversity of problems. They came from communities determined and willing to do something about those problems.

Two factors emerged from these applications:

First, they comprise a searching and detailed pathology of the urban ills of America.

And, secondly, they brought forth greater ingenuity and imagination for the solution of those urban ills than ever had been seen before.

In the process, the self analysis and ex-

change of information and stimulation of thinking that took place in these communities has had an impact that will be of lasting benefit to us all.

Making a selection from among the 193 applications received by HUD was an extremely difficult and time consuming task.

The applications were reviewed not only by HUD, which is responsible for administering this program, but by an interagency review committee composed of representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Labor; Agriculture; Commerce; and Justice; and the Office of Economic Opportunity. It, like the Model Cities Program itself, was truly an Administration-wide effort, cutting across the activities of many departments and agencies.

The purpose was clear: To select those neighborhoods, all across the country, where the concentration and coordination of Federally-assisted programs could have the maximum impact in solving urban problems.

The criteria by which the applications were judged were:

Scope of the analysis of the problems involved.

Innovative approaches.

Capacity to carry out the program.

Commitment of city government and private groups.

Geography and population.

The cities which were chosen—and, of course, the responsibility for the selection is mine—will share in the \$11 million in planning funds which Congress has appropriated for the first round of applications. If they successfully complete the planning process, they will share also in the \$300 million which Congress has just appropriated for supplemental grants and extra urban renewal funds expressly earmarked for Model Cities. Unfortunately, they will not be able to share in an additional \$350 million which President Johnson had requested for this program—but which Congress did not appropriate.

There is, however, another \$12 million in planning funds which has been appropriated for a second round of applications. We will soon be inviting applications for this second round.

It is our hope that many of the cities that applied for the first round, and were not selected for planning funds, will join other localities in applying for the second round. And we intend to work closely with those cities which were unsuccessful in helping them develop their applications.

Before giving you the list of cities, however let me emphasize one more thing just as clearly as I can.

This program is part of the great vision which President Johnson has had for the future of the American city and those who live there. It is part of a dream—or, if you will, a conviction—that this country has the energy and the resources and the will to build decent communities where Americans can live in comfort and in dignity.

The pathway leading up to this announcement today has been a long one, and has involved the efforts of many people, but none more than the President himself.

Long ago—even before the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development—he set up a task force charged with finding new approaches to building a decent urban life in America. Two of the men who were on that task force now serve with me in this department—Under Secretary Robert Wood and Assistant Secretary Charles Haar.

One of the ideas they and the other distinguished Americans associated with them proposed, and which President Johnson made part of his program, is what has become the Model Cities program.

The President fought against tremendous odds to win the authority for this program from Congress and against even greater odds to win the funds for it.

The funds Congress finally made available

were far short of what he asked and what is needed. But they were short because there were some who sit in Congress who could not or would not see what this program meant to the people of this country.

It is my hope that as the cities we announce today move ahead in their planning and as more and more of those who live in these communities become involved, that perhaps the members of Congress will understand this program a little better and appreciate it a little more. Perhaps if they do, the story on next year's appropriations will be different.

For the Model Cities program to succeed, there must be full involvement of the skills, commitment, and resources of Federal, state, county, and city governments with neighborhood residents, private enterprise, organized labor, and community agencies and organizations of all types.

The neighborhoods that have been selected for the first round of the program represent every section of the country. They are in communities of all sizes. They have an incredible diversity and complexity of problems. They represent the hard core both of need and of opportunity in meeting our urban problems. They are on the cutting edge of American life. For in them we shall start now to transform blight and decay into health and hope.

In the target areas there are one million families, or over four million people. Nearly a third of the families have incomes of less than \$3,000 a year, and the vast majority earn less than the median income level in the locality. A fourth live in substandard housing, and many more are overcrowded in deteriorating buildings. Unemployment is double the national level and there is substantial under-employment. A third of the adults have less than an eighth-grade education. The infant mortality rate is double that for the nation as a whole.

These figures reflect some of the major social, economic, and physical ills which will be the concern of the Model Cities program. It is designed to develop and carry out a comprehensive, coordinated attack to deal with the human and physical needs of the target areas. Its purpose is not to patch up the community but to uncover and deal with the root causes of its deficiencies.

And herein lies the true significance of the Model Cities and the reason the program has been so identified. Not only is it a more concentrated and fundamental approach to the basic problems of our cities than has ever before been undertaken. But out of it should come models for dealing with these problems throughout urban America.

Our task now is to work closely with the cities on the specifics of their proposals in order that effective programs can be launched in each of the neighborhoods. This will be given top priority and all of the other Departments and agencies concerned with urban problems will join with us as partners in this effort.

As soon as I have finished reading the names of the cities, printed lists will be available at either side of the room, and data sheets on each of the communities will be available on tables in the corridor outside.

I know that some of you want to get the word back to your offices as soon as possible, so we will interrupt the proceedings for about five minutes so those who need to do so can leave. Then we will reconvene to answer your questions. With me to help in that are Under Secretary Wood, Assistant Secretary H. Ralph Taylor who is responsible for the administration of the Model Cities program, and the Director of the Model Cities Administration, Walter G. Farr.

One last word:

President Johnson during recent conversations with President Diaz Ordaz of Mexico discussed the possibilities of a joint program for rehabilitating an urban area that



stretches across the borders of the two countries.

As a first step in implementing this proposal the Department of Housing and Urban Development is initiating conversations with Mayor J. C. Martin of Laredo, Texas, in an effort to assist him in qualifying the city for a Model Cities planning grant. It is hoped the authorities in Mexico will concurrently take action to initiate similar planning in Nuevo Laredo.

#### CITIES SELECTED FOR MODEL CITY PLANNING GRANTS

(City populations based on 1965 estimates)

Alabama: Huntsville (127,000).  
 Arkansas: Texarkana (21,000).  
 California: Fresno (156,000), Oakland (378,000), Richmond (83,000).  
 Colorado: Denver (520,000), Trinidad (10,000).  
 Connecticut: Bridgeport (156,000), Hartford (158,000), New Haven (151,000).  
 District of Columbia: Washington, D.C. (802,000).  
 Florida: Dade County (1,064,000), Tampa (305,000).  
 Georgia: Atlanta (535,000), Gainesville (18,000).  
 Hawaii: Honolulu (611,000).  
 Illinois: Chicago (3,520,000), East St. Louis (82,000).  
 Indiana: Gary (179,000).  
 Iowa: Des Moines (216,000).  
 Kentucky: Pikesville (5,000).  
 Maine: Portland (72,000).  
 Maryland: Baltimore (925,000).  
 Massachusetts: Boston (616,000), Cambridge (104,000), Lowell (87,000), Springfield (166,000).  
 Michigan: Detroit (1,660,000), Highland Park (36,000).  
 Minnesota: Duluth (104,000), Minneapolis (465,000).  
 Missouri: Kansas City (530,000), St. Louis (710,000).  
 New Hampshire: Manchester (90,000).  
 New Jersey: Hoboken (47,000), Newark (395,000), Trenton (107,000).  
 New Mexico: Albuquerque (242,000).  
 New York: Buffalo (505,000), Central and East Harlem, New York City, South Bronx, New York City, Central Brooklyn, New York City, (8,080,000), Poughkeepsie (37,000), Rochester (305,000).  
 North Carolina: Charlotte (230,000).  
 Ohio: Columbus (540,000), Dayton (260,000), Toledo (354,000).  
 Oklahoma: Tulsa (280,000).  
 Oregon: Portland (380,000).  
 Pennsylvania: Philadelphia (2,030,000), Pittsburgh (560,000), Reading-Berks County (95,000), Wilkes Barre (59,000).  
 Puerto Rico: San Juan (580,000).  
 Rhode Island: Providence (190,000).  
 Tennessee: Nashville-Davidson County (261,000), Smithville-DeKalb County (11,000).  
 Texas: Eagle Pass (14,000), San Antonio (645,000), Texarkana (32,000), Waco (105,000).  
 Vermont: Winooski (8,000).  
 Virginia: Norfolk (322,000).  
 Washington: Seattle (565,000).

#### WHO'S BANKRUPT?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, GERALD FORD, is quoted as saying today "A man about to go into bank-

ruptcy"—in commenting on President Johnson's news conference.

I know the personal and corporate income of this country is reaching a new high with all predictions that our GNP will top \$850 billion in 1968. The American people have more jobs than ever in history. Our economy is strong.

President Johnson has led us in the finest domestic program in the history of our country, especially in Education, Health, and Welfare.

The Wall Street Journal today states home building is 76 percent ahead of last year's pace; auto production slated to climb 34 percent this week.

At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD an article by Joseph W. Sullivan, entitled "House GOP Activism Takes a Drubbing."

President Johnson is for America and for the people. The article follows:

HOUSE GOP "ACTIVISM" TAKES A DRUBBING

(By Joseph W. Sullivan)

WASHINGTON.—House Republican resolve to accentuate the positive has just about dissolved.

Whatever else it was, this week's floor skirmish over the "war on poverty" was a debacle for the self-styled GOP activists bent on tarnishing Johnson Administration programs by pushing contrasting, positive, proposals of their own.

Far from fracturing the Johnson poverty war, the antipoverty overhaul so ardently crafted by Republican Albert Quie of Minnesota and Charles Goodell of New York was itself demolished on the floor. And the demolition crew was by no means solely Democratic, although the remarkably unified assaults of Northern Democratic liberals and conservative Dixiecrats was assuredly a factor. Rather, most of the disintegration took place within the GOP's own ranks as a bevy of party factions, for a bevy of reasons, found fault with the one concrete design that architects Quie and Goodell managed to erect.

When the hour came Wednesday night to offer what they'd dubbed the GOP's "opportunity crusade" as a substitute for the Johnson "war on poverty," there was so much dissidence within the party that the entire design was scrapped. Instead, Minority Leader Gerald Ford cast his lot for the oldest of old shoe GOP legislative tactics: A hobnailed motion to whack \$460 million from the \$2.06 billion sought by the Administration to maintain the program unaltered.

#### ECONOMY BANNER

The motion carried handily, as the House GOP's predominant conservative wing and most Dixie Democrats once again coalesced behind the same economy banner that's enabled them to repulse or curtail hundreds of domestic spending schemes over the past three decades. But the motion's victory only adds force to the crushing defeat of the Quie-Goodell doctrine, which holds that any such negative strikes at Democratic programs must be coupled with a GOP presentation of alternatives. Ironically, as well, it marks abandonment of that doctrine, in the crunch by Minority Leader Ford, whose elevation to that post in 1965 was primarily the product of a campaign to put a more positive face on the party, a campaign in which Messrs. Quie and Goodell were two of the ring leaders.

"We lost," was all that the usually voluble Mr. Goodell chose to say under the sting of Wednesday night's reproof. His very taciturnity conveyed despair about the prospects, if not self-doubt about the wisdom, of the entire positive approach. Earlier this year he and Mr. Quie took a similar hiding when they tried to convert the Administration's many Federally directed aid programs for elemen-

tary and secondary schools into a single "block grant" plan allowing each state to set its own aid-use priorities.

After two set-downs on the two big issues that the GOP has attempted to raise in the House this year, further Quie-Goodell attempts at positivism figure to come haltingly if at all. And for the bulk of their party colleagues the moral is now clearly drawn: That espousing new or alternative programs courts trouble, that it's safer just to oppose unpalatable Administration programs outright or go along with those that can be swallowed.

The reversion is a product of a melange of external pressures on the GOP lawmakers and internal irritants among them. Though interrelated, they can be sorted under three major headings.

Probably the prime factor is the superior resources available to the party in control of the Federal Executive establishment for communicating its side of an issue, through the press and to affected interest groups, and for mobilizing grass roots support. A President can, almost inherently, command more attention for his denunciation than the minority party in Congress can for its proposals. The GOP's school aid plan, for example, received almost no press attention until Mr. Johnson began denouncing it as a dire threat to present assistance mechanisms. With program managers or aid recipients spread among hundreds of communities, moreover, such established ventures as school aid and the war on poverty are assured a cadre of boosters in every Congressional district in the land. Like human beings generally, they're inclined more toward the known functions of a familiar program than to an unknown. Republican design, especially when the Washington minions with whom they deal are portraying the GOP design as catastrophic.

Thus, in the case of both their school aid and antipoverty alternatives, Messrs. Quie and Goodell were outflanked on the propaganda front. Not only did their attempts to paint a favorable contrast to Administration programs fail to get much public notice, they weren't even able to combat all the abuse the Administration forces heaped upon them. And, as a result of this nationwide "communications gap," nearly every Republican in the House was subjected to a pummeling.

For example, in a Wednesday editorial that showed no awareness of the GOP "opportunity crusade" alternative, the Republican-inclined Detroit Free Press blasted Mr. Ford as a "blockhead" for failing to back extension of the existing program. The editorial sent quivers through all 12 Michigan Republicans in the House, according to one of them. Nor were they, or other big-state GOP delegations, immune to the appeals for as-is backing of the poverty war that came from more than a score of major companies, many of them holding contracts for the operation of job corps training centers and other antipoverty activities. According to House Democratic tacticians, the Administration enrolled the Washington representatives of 23 big companies to lobby for the program.

The prime internal factor leading to party burial of the Quie-Goodell push is what one liberal Republican has dubbed the "game" psychology that takes hold of the GOP during House floor fights. After invariably getting kicked around by the Democrats during the skirmishing that precedes decisive, record-vote decisions, according to the game theory, Republicans start itching for some kind of a victory. And in their gusto of the moment to clobber the Democrats on a floor vote, many appear to let ideology, long-range issue development and all other considerations give way to the fashioning of a motion that's tailored solely to win.

That's what happened Wednesday night, after three stormy days in which the Democratic Party's Northern and Southern wings had rebuffed every component of the Quie-Goodell "reform" package as they were offered in preliminary, piecemeal fashion.



Among them: Initiation of an Industry Youth Corps for routing unskilled school dropouts into private industry jobs through temporary Federal subsidization of their wages; "phasing over" the far-flung grid of job corps camps into a system of "residential skill centers" that would also lift problem youths out of bad home environments but would keep them in the urban community to which they ultimately must adjust; consolidating project Head Start for disadvantaged pre-school children with other Federal school aid programs in the Office of Education, and, most integral of all, providing a bigger guaranteed voice for the impoverished in shaping "community action" projects, along with continued independence for the private, non-profit corporations that run these ventures in many localities.

#### LURE TO DIXIECRATS

The legislation's Northern Democrats managers had found the key to Southern help by providing for the transfer to elected city officials of control over all community action funds and personnel. The clear appeal of such a transfer: Elimination of the threat that Washington might fund some private group too zealous in its pursuit of Negro equality, or too hostile toward white community mores. The lure to Dixiecrats of this city hall hegemony transcended even their yearnings for Federal frugality; any GOP package proposal that coupled spending cuts with restoration of autonomy for community action groups would have failed to attract the Dixie backing needed to win the floor game.

"If all our great floor fighters could see beyond the end of the legislative day, it might have occurred to them that it would have done a lot more for the party to lose with our reform package than to win a naked spending cut," gripes one disaffected party liberal. "As a 1968 campaign issue, a record vote on the package plan would have provided ammunition to use against Democrats of every stripe. In urban liberal districts we could knock them for voting down our effort to keep the program out of the clutches of big city political bosses. In the South, we could hit them for failing to support the spending cut. And nearly everywhere, I think, we've got the best side of the issue when we say the program needs general overhaul."

Within the party, however, this is a minority view, weighing the Quile-Goodell plan's worth not in terms of Congressional districts already held by the GOP but in terms of those the party needs to capture to gain control of the House. The third big reason why positivism is on the skids within the party in the House is that not many lawmakers do their thinking in these terms. Although most pay lip service to the need for staking out positions that will enhance the party cause, a tough vote invariably leaves them urging an overall party position that enhances their personal positions with the homefolk.

For a dominant number of Republicans already in Congress—especially senior ones—"homefolks" is the suburbs and outcountry areas of the Middle West, so theirs is the prevalent viewpoint. And in the small towns of the Middle West, the Quile-Goodell concept of community action autonomy not only isn't a vote-getter, it might well be a vote-loser against a Democratic opponent championing city hall control of the poverty war to keep out radicals.

#### ANDERSON INDEPENDENT BLASTS REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS ON VIETNAM

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Anderson, S.C., Independent has bluntly stated what many of us have suspected for some time—Republican Governors are making a political football out of the Vietnam war.

At the annual Governors Conference in 1966, the Republican Governors willingly placed themselves behind the effort of this Nation to stop Communist aggression.

But in 1967 their tune has changed. With a Presidential election year ahead they have refused to support our war effort. As the Independent stated:

The purpose of these cynical maneuvers is obviously to keep the GOP's options open for next year's Presidential campaign.

They have sacrificed the national interest of the altar of political expediency. At a time when national unity is essential, the Republican Governors have added an element of disharmony to what should be a united front.

With their own party badly split over the war, with no constructive alternatives of their own, and with leading Republican Governors looking out more for personal than national interests, the Republican Party in 1968 expects to capitalize on the Vietnam war.

By refusing to follow the dictum of Senator Vandenberg—one of the most distinguished Republican advocates of a bipartisan foreign policy—that "politics stops at the water's edge" they will be justly repudiated by the voters on the very issue upon which they cynically hope to capitalize.

I include the editorial from the Anderson Independent in the RECORD:

#### GOP HOPEFULS PLAYING WAR POLITICS BUT CAN'T AGREE ON POLICY OF OWN

The Republican governors, who at the 1966 annual Governors Conference were willing enough and even eager to put themselves on record behind the American effort to thwart Communist aggression in Vietnam, blocked any Vietnam resolution at all at this year's annual get-together, which took place all at sea on a pleasure ship in the Caribbean.

South Carolina's Gov. Robert McNair said it was apparent political considerations caused the GOP contingent to block this year's resolution.

The resolution simply put the governors on record as supporting the U.S. war effort in Vietnam with emphasis on the men doing the fighting.

The resolution was not, as Gov. McNair noted, endorsement of the Johnson administration or was broad enough to serve as an umbrella over policies being followed.

Republican Chairman Harry Dent's charge that Gov. McNair was playing a role of "secret agent" for the President is too absurd to deserve comment.

Do the GOP governors have a Republican alternative of their own?

The fact of the matter is that they're split eight ways from Sunday on the issue.

California's Gov. Ronald Reagan thinks the Johnson administration isn't hawkish enough; New York's Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has edged a feather's distance toward the dove side; "Mr. Clean"—Gov. George Romney of Michigan—is still looking for a

position to replace the one he held after his alleged "brainwashing" by administration personnel, including a fellow who now serves as his foreign policy advisor.

Ohio's Gov. James A. Rhodes alone desired to support a resolution backing the administration's policies, but he was outnumbered, or outshouted, by his Republican colleagues.

The purpose of these cynical maneuvers is obviously to keep the GOP's options open for next year's Presidential campaign.

Like the apocryphal editor who was asked where he stood on a controversial matter that had divided his town in twain, they haven't made up their minds, but when they do they'll be bitter.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TIERNAN (at the request of Mr. JOELSON), for Friday, November 17, 1967, on account of official business.

Mr. STUCKEY (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Georgia), for Friday, November 17, 1967, on account of official business.

Mr. RIVERS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for November 17 through November 27, on account of official business.

Mr. WHITENER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, November 17, on account of official business.

Mr. KEE (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for Friday, November 17, Monday, November 20, and Tuesday, November 21, on account of official business.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, for November 17 through November 30, on account of official business in district.

Mr. HALLECK (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through November 22, on account of official business as an official representative to the NATO Parliamentary Conference.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through November 27, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to NATO.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through November 27, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to NATO.

Mr. BURKE of Florida (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BERRY (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through November 27, on account of official business as an official representative to the NATO Parliamentary Conference.

Mr. BATES (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through December 18, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to NATO and on official inspection trip to Vietnam.

Mr. ARENDS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through November 24, on account of official business as U.S. delegate to NATO.

Mrs. RED of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the balance of week, on account of illness in family.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CAHILL (at the request of Mr. CONABLE), for 1 hour, on November 21,



1967; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUILLIN, for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. TENZER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONABLE) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. WINN.

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. McCULLOCH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. IRWIN.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 687. An act for the relief of Tin Shik Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 964. An act for the relief of Roberto Perdomo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1040. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1470. An act for the relief of the Ida group of mining claims in Josephine County, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1652. An act for the relief of Anastasia D. Mpatziani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1664. An act for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1918. An act for the relief of Dr. Gabriel Gomez del Rio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1925. An act for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Martinez Serrano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2031. An act for the relief of certain employees at the Naval Air Test Center, U.S. Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2153. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose Rafael Montalvo Urrutibea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2199. An act for the relief of Oscar Juan Enriquez-Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2206. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Rolando Guerra-Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2264. An act for the relief of Chi Jen Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2265. An act for the relief of Christopher Nicholas Rushton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2301. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco Guillermo Gomez-Inguanzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2381. An act for the relief of Dr. Jesus Adalberto Quevedo-Avila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2382. An act for the relief of Dr. Jose R. Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2384. An act for the relief of Jorge A. Marrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2386. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis F. Rodriguez Iznaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2468. An act for the relief of Dr. George S. Ioannides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLISON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1963. An act for the relief of employees of General Services Administration;

H.R. 2517. An act to amend sections 64a, 238, 378, and 483 of the Bankruptcy Act and to repeal sections 354 and 459 of the act;

H.R. 2518. An act to amend sections 337 and 338 of the Bankruptcy Act and to add new section 339;

H.R. 2519. An act to amend sections 334, 355, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act;

H.R. 2834. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to the participation of the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization;

H.R. 3403. An act for the relief of Harry LeRoy Jones;

H.R. 3727. An act for the relief of Elpidio Dimacali Damazo and Natividad Simsuangco Damazo;

H.R. 3799. An act for the relief of the city of Pawtucket, R.I.;

H.R. 6324. An act for the relief of John A. Danisch;

H.R. 7599. An act for the relief of Dr. Emanuel Marcus;

H.R. 8632. An act to amend sections 40c(1) and 52a of the Bankruptcy Act so as to reallocate part of the filing fee from the clerk's earnings to the Referees' Salary and Expense Fund; and

H.R. 7811. An act for the relief of Richard Alan White.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 20, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 11276. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Adult Education Act of 1966 for 2 additional years; with amendment (Rept. No. 955). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1477. An act to amend section 301 of title III of the act of August 14, 1946, relating to the establishment by the Secretary of Agriculture of a national advisory committee, to provide for annual meetings of such committee (Rept. No. 956). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 6437. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit advance payments to wheat producers (Rept. No. 967). Referred to the Committee

of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11542. A bill for the relief of the town of Bremen, Ind.; with amendment (Rept. No. 968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 555. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements as to understanding the English language before their naturalization as citizens of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 969). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOSS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on world newsprint supply-demand outlook through 1969 (Rept. No. 970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 13706. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4961. A bill for the relief of Donald E. Crichton (Rept. No. 957). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5854. A bill for the relief of Mrs. E. Juanita Collinson; with amendment (Rept. No. 958). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7909. A bill for the relief of Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., of New York, N.Y.; with amendment (Rept. No. 959). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8391. A bill for the relief of Adel Lessert Bellmard, Clement Lessert, Josephine Gonvil Pappan, Julie Gonvil Pappan, Pelagie Gonvil Franceour de Aubri, Victor Gonvil Pappan, Marie Gonvil, Lafesche Gonvil, Louis Laventure, Elizabeth Carbonau Vertifelle, Pierre Carbonau, Louis Jonas, Basil Jonas, James Jonas, Elizabeth Dacherute, Joseph Butler, William Rodger, Joseph Cote, four children of Cicili Compare and Joseph James, or the heirs of any who may be deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10050. A bill for the relief of Capt. Russell T. Randall; with amendment (Rept. No. 961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11166. A bill for the relief of Earl S. Haldeman, Jr. (Rept. No. 962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 13373. A bill for the relief of Richard C. Mockler (Rept. No. 963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11959. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Nesbitt; with amendment (Rept. No. 964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2270. A bill for the relief of Lt. David Campbell; with amendment (Rept. No. 965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.



Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4058. A bill for the relief of the JE-IL Brick Co. (Rept. No. 966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself and Mr. KYL):

H.R. 14068. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 14069. A bill to amend section 602 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for certain veterans a presumption of service connection for mental disorders which develop within 5 years after separation from service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 14070. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 14071. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 14072. A bill to provide for a Federal Athletic Commission to regulate organized sports when and to the extent that such regulation is in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 14073. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the independence of the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 14074. A bill to amend the act of September 9, 1963, authorizing the construction of an entrance road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 14075. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase to \$30,000 the maximum servicemen's group life insurance which may be provided members of the uniformed services on active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14076. A bill to restore non-service-connected veterans' pensions which have been reduced or eliminated because of the receipt of increased social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 14077. A bill for the relief of Domenico Lo Brano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14078. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Noto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 14079. A bill for the relief of Lts. (jg.) Herbert F. Swanson, John C. Markowicz, John T. Cox, George T. Ankrum, and Gerald E. Sheldon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 14080. A bill for the relief of Lts. (jg.) Herbert F. Swanson, John C. Markowicz, John T. Cox, George T. Ankrum, and Gerald

E. Sheldon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 14081. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Mazzola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 14082. A bill for the relief of Filippo Butera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 14083. A bill for the relief of Shafiq S. Shaya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 14084. A bill for the relief of Eustachio V. Favla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 14085. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Emillo Latour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 14086. A bill for the relief of Lts. (jg.) Herbert F. Swanson, John C. Markowicz, John T. Cox, George T. Ankrum, and Gerald E. Sheldon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1967

The Senate met at 10 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Before the toil of a new day opens before us, we lay before Thee the meditations of our hearts: may they be acceptable in Thy sight.

We are conscious as we bow at this altar of Thy grace that if we live a life of prayer Thou art present everywhere. Amid the duties of these demanding days, by the spiritual resources that are found in Thee alone, restore our jaded spirits.

We come in deep anxiety concerning the world the next generation will inherit from our hands.

Facing decisions freighted with destiny, unite our hearts and minds, we beseech Thee, in a mighty purpose that our Nation's strength, material and spiritual, be dedicated to throw open the gates of more abundant life for all mankind.

Lord, in this hour of tumult,  
Lord, in this night of fears,  
Keep open, oh, keep open  
Our eyes, our hearts, our ears.

We ask it in the name which is above every name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 16, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW—MODIFICATION OF ORDER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader will yield, there has already been some inquiry—

and there will be more today—as to whether or not there will be a Saturday session. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished minority leader has raised that question.

I ask unanimous consent at this time that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Subsequently, this order was modified to provide for the Senate to adjourn from today until 10 a.m. on Monday, November 20, 1967.)

## LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 737.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## REFERENCE OF RELIEF BILL FOR N. M. BENTLEY PARTNERSHIP

The resolution (S. Res. 154) to refer the bill (S. 2224) entitled "A bill for the relief of N. M. Bentley, a partnership consisting of N. M. Bentley and George Markwalter," to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims for a report thereon was considered and agreed to as follows:

S. RES. 154

*Resolved*, That the bill (S. 2224) entitled "A bill for the relief of N. M. Bentley, a partnership consisting of N. M. Bentley and George Markwalter," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims; and the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 767), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed resolution is to authorize the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims to proceed under the provi-